



TRACTS,

OCCASIONED BY THE

PUBLICATION OF A CHARGE,

DELIVERED

TO THE CLERGY

OF

THE DIOCESE OF DURHAM,

BY SHUTE, BISHOP OF DURHAM,

IN 1806.

BY THE

REV. J. LINGARD.

NEWCASTLE:

PRINTED BY EDWARD WALKER, PILGRIM-STREET;

AND SOLD BY KEATINGS AND CO. DUKE-STREET, GROSVENOR-SQUARE; BOOKER, NEW BOND-STREET, LONDON; BELL, NEWCASTLE; AND SHARROCKS, PRESTON.

1813.

THE ACTS

OF THE PARLIAMENT

PUBLICATION OF A CHANGE

IN THE

TO THE CLERGY

THE SOCIETY OF BISHOPS

BY THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

IN THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

P R E F A C E.

For the information of the Reader, it may be expedient to premise, that the Tracts contained in this volume, owe their existence to the publication of a Charge, delivered by the Bishop of Durham, to the clergy of his diocese, in 1806. That Charge, while it professed to delineate the creed of the catholic church, attributed to it doctrines, which its professors disclaim, and loaded it with imputations, which they contend it does not deserve. An answer was published, under the title of “Remarks on a Charge, delivered by the Bishop of Durham.”

Whatever might be the merits or demerits of that little tract, it appears to have excited no small commotion among the established clergy. A host of writers was soon embattled under the episcopal banner; and all their efforts were employed to chastise the temerity of the Remarker. He was not, however, dismayed by the number or the abilities of his opponents; and the tracts which he wrote in his own defence, are presented in this collection to the public.

After a long interval, and at a time when the controversy seemed to be forgotten, the right reverend Prelate thought proper to descend into the field himself, and point his spear against the popish shield of the Remarker. In a Letter to his Clergy, he endeavoured to refute the catholic doctrine respecting the eucharist, to give a plausible meaning to the doctrine of the church of England on the same subject, and to fasten on his adversary the guilt of misrepresentation. This letter

provoked a reply, under the title of “Remarks on a late Pamphlet, entitled the Grounds on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome, reconsidered.” It closes the present collection.

The fate of the last publication was similar to that of its elder brother. It was assailed by a number of writers, both with and without names. Of these, the most distinguished, if not by the public, at least by their patron, were the “Parochial Minister,” and the Rector of Newton Longville. To the former the Remarker *could* not, to the latter he *would* not reply. What cannot be understood, cannot be answered. The Parochial Minister had called his publication “Three more Pebbles fresh from the Brook, or the Romish Goliath slain with his own Weapon:” nor were the contents of the work any disgrace to the title. It faithfully observed the precept of Horace:

Servetur ad imum,
Qualis ab incepto processerit, et sibi constet.

To Mr Le Mesurier he did not conceive it necessary to reply. Notwithstanding the confident denial of that gentleman, he trusted his readers would give him credit for the knowledge of his own belief; and after so many replies and rejoinders, he thought it time that this religious war should terminate. In that opinion he was happy to find himself supported by the conduct of the right reverend Prelate himself, who, in his next Charge, though he took care to mention, did not think it proper to resume, the controversy.

Against the Remarker it has been repeatedly urged by most of his adversaries, that he is an unfair disputant; that he has disguised the real doctrines of his church; that he has attempted to deceive the credulity of his readers, by presenting them with a false but flattering portrait of the catholic creed. He will reply, that the

charge is both improbable and unfounded. It is improbable, because the fraud could be productive of little benefit, and must have been the cause of much mischief. He is not so weak-sighted a politician as to purchase a momentary victory, at the expence of future defeat and lasting infamy. Had he descended to so disingenuous an artifice, it must soon have been detected, and the detection would have necessarily served to confirm the hostility of the protestant, and to loosen the attachment of the catholic, to that cause which he had undertaken to defend. Neither does he hesitate to say that it is unfounded, and to stake his character on the accuracy of the assertion. For this purpose he has been induced to prefix his name to the present edition.

The right reverend Prelate, in his last address to his clergy, was induced to hail as “ a favourable omen, the abhorrence
“ which papists express in general terms a-
“ gainst the charges of idolatry, blasphemy,

“ sacrilege, and impiety ;” and to cherish a hope that “ such dispositions might ultimately lead to the long desired measure of catholic union between two so large portions of the church of Christ as the churches of England and Rome.” That were indeed a consummation devoutly to be wished : and as a preliminary step, to which no candid man will object, it may be requested, that the protestant prelates would condescend to learn the catholic doctrines from the catholics themselves, and would renounce the right which they so frequently claim and exercise, of dictating to us the articles of our belief. Let them distrust the assertions of interested polemics, and venture to study our creed in some of those authors, who have carefully distinguished the doctrines of our church, both from the erroneous tenets attributed to us by our adversaries, and the unauthorised opinions of private individuals in our communion.* This would, indeed, re-

* Such as Holden, *Analysis fidei* ; Veron, *Regula*

quire the sacrifice of many prejudices, to which education and reading have given the form of undoubted truth: but that sacrifice would be amply repaid by its beneficial effects. It would shew them that the partition wall, which has hitherto divided the two churches, is not composed of such stubborn materials, as they have been taught to believe; and that if on some points the doctrines of catholics and protestants are opposed to each other, yet on many the opposition is more imaginary than real. It would sweep away the rubbish which has been accumulating during almost three centuries of religious altercation, and would do more towards the effecting of a catholic union, than the preaching of fifty charges replete with the misrepresentations of antiquated controversialists.

fidei; Bossuet, *Exposition de la doctrine de l'église Catholique*; and *An Essay on Catholic Communion*, by a Minister of the Church of England.

But this Preface must not be closed without some notice of another objection which, with much real or affected indignation, has been urged against the Remarker : that he has not treated his adversaries with that respect which they may justly claim. He may reply with truth, that his object was not so much to wound their feelings, as to teach them to respect the feelings of others. The Charge of the Bishop of Durham was not certainly of a nature to excite very pleasurable sensations. Infallible in his decisions, the right reverend Prelate convicted, without ceremony, the great body of christians at the present day, and with them their predecessors through a long succession of ages, of many of the worst crimes of which human nature is capable, of idolatry, of sacrilege, of blasphemy, of impiety, &c. &c. &c. His advocates were eager to tread in his footsteps; and most of them improved on his example. With pious

industry they raked together the filth of ancient controversy, and poured it without mercy on the Remarker and the church, of which it is his pride to be a member. Certainly men who deal so copiously in hard words, should not complain, if they sometimes meet with them in return. If they demand respect themselves, let them also respect a much more numerous society of christians, who have no reason to think themselves their inferiors in talents, learning, or judgment.

Yet let it not be thought that the Remarker is an advocate for what the bishop has called "impassioned controversy." He believes that the discussion of religious subjects may be conducted with temper and forbearance; and under this impression he has reviewed the following pages, and carefully expunged the few passages which he thought might reasonably give offence. If he has occasionally laughed at the errors, the wiles, or the

zeal of his adversaries, he trusts the reader will not condemn him.

Ridentem dicere verum

Quid vetat?

REMARKS

ON A

CHARGE

DELIVERED TO

THE CLERGY

OF THE

DIOCESE OF DURHAM,

BY

SHUTE, BISHOP OF DURHAM,

AT THE

ORDINARY VISITATION OF THAT DIOCESE IN
THE YEAR 1806.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

Exod. xx. 16.

Les sophismes les plus brillans disparaissent devant la simple verite.

La Harpe.

THE NEW

CLARENCE

THOMAS

OF THE

THE

AT

P R E F A C E
TO THE THIRD EDITION.

SINCE the first publication of these Remarks, the Charge of the Bishop of Durham has gone through a second edition, and has been honoured with a second title: "The Grounds on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome." With due submission to superior judgment, I think the alteration impolitic. To discuss the reasons, which induced the English Protestants to separate from the Catholic communion, is a subject of dangerous investigation. There is much in the reformation more adapted to scandalize than to edify the dispassionate enquirer. In its origin and progress there was too much of human policy and human passion, too much of intrigue, duplicity, and violence, to characterize a work inspired by God for the amelioration of mankind. The Protestant is the established church. This should satisfy her ambition. In the present temper of mankind, while she remains in possession of wealth and honour, she may deem herself secure. Let her be content with her present glories, and cast a decent veil over the infirmity of her birth,

But if her Prelates will provoke the discussion ; if they will drag into public notice the motives, which influenced the establishment of protestantism in these realms, let them not be surprised if some Catholic writer step forward to reveal the scandal of former times, and paint the true characters of “ the magnanimous fathers of the reformation.” He will probably assign as the cause of their separation from the Church of Rome, not the motives so zealously inculcated by the Bishop of Durham, but the impetuous passion of Henry the Eighth, who renounced the authority of the Pontiff, that he might give to his mistress a seat on his throne ; the rapacity of the courtiers of Edward the Sixth, who to fill their own coffers, promoted with all their influence the godly work of the reformation ; and the policy of Elizabeth, who rejected an authority which she could not acknowledge, without confessing her mother’s shame, and her own illegitimacy.

But without discussing at present the real causes, which produced the separation of the Church of England from the Church of Rome, it may be fairly assumed that the arguments by which the Bishop of Durham has attempted to justify that separation, are the most plausible and satisfactory that can be adduced. To think otherwise would be an insult to the learning of the Prelate, and the discernment of the auditory, at whose urgent request he consented to publish his Charge. If then, in the following pages, I have shewn that these arguments are weak and inconclusive, that some of them recoil with

double force against himself, and that the others are founded, not on the real doctrines of the Catholics, but on the calumnies of their adversaries; it will naturally follow that the cause of the Church of England has failed in the hands of a Prelate, the most able, the most willing, and the most interested, to support it. But of this the impartial reader must judge. One thing only let him bear in mind, that the Bishop was the aggressor. His zeal led him to the attack. From one extremity of his diocese to the other, he preached a crusade against the opinions, I had almost said the persons, of Catholics. He described them as idolaters, as children of ignorance, detractors from the passion of Christ, and enemies to the honour of God. The limits of his diocese were too narrow to confine his benevolence: he resolved to extend the benefit of his Charge to the whole nation. He presented it to his majesty at a very critical period; he published it and re-published it; he gave it first one title and then another; he printed it in quarto for the rich, and in duodecimo for the poor; he made himself all to all, that he might communicate to all his enmity to the opinions of Catholics. After so much provocation we certainly may be allowed to speak in our own defence.

Ενεστι και μυρμηκι και σερφω χολη.

[illegible]

... ..

... ..

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

REMARKS, &c.

A PAMPHLET has lately been published under a title calculated to command respect, and ensure popularity ; *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham*, by *Shute, Bishop of Durham*. It is, or would seem to be, the dying exhortation of a venerable prelate, “ whose years have already “ exceeded the ordinary age of man : ” his last instructions to his reverend brethren, the clergy of his diocese : a legacy of love, which, in the fervour of affection, he has bequeathed to his spiritual children. With eagerness I opened the book ; and my wishes already anticipated the moderation, the liberality, the benevolence of an aged prelate, who was unwilling to sink into the grave, without leaving to posterity a lasting monument of his piety and pastoral solicitude. I saw him, like the Saviour of mankind, entertaining himself for the last time with his disciples ; and anxiously enforcing, by his example and discourse,

those sentiments of universal charity so beautifully described in the charge which Christ delivered to his apostles on the eve of his passion.* I must confess, I was most grievously disappointed. The Christian bishop had dwindled into the angry polemic : and the object of the publication appeared to be, not to draw nearer the bands of unity and affection, not to exhort the clergy to a conscientious discharge of their respective duties ; but to quicken the diffusion of religious prejudice, and to misrepresent the creed of a most numerous class of his majesty's subjects. I treated it with the inattention which I conceived it to deserve ; and, till I learned that it had been presented to the king by the zealous prelate himself, I almost persuaded myself that it was the fabrication of some obscure controvertist, who, to exalt his own insignificancy, had assumed the venerable name of Shute, Bishop of Durham.

The man who embraces a religious opinion from conviction, has undoubtedly the right to maintain it by argument. But truth will be his first and principal object : and the champion of truth will disdain the petty artifices of substituting assertion for proof, and misrepresentation for fact. He will never condescend to swell the crowd of disputants, whose ingenuity first frames a creed for the church of Rome, and then, after combating a phantom of its own creation, exults in an

* St John xiv. xv. xvi.

easy and decisive victory. That this expedient should have been frequently adopted by the herd of minor and hungry writers, is not surprising. It has often proved the most certain road to reputation, and, what they probably valued more than reputation, to wealth and preferment.* But the Bishop of Durham is placed far above such paltry temptations. The reputation which he enjoys, may satisfy his utmost ambition; and the ecclesiastical dignity which he fills, if not the first in rank, is at least the first in opulence in the United Kingdom. If then, notwithstanding his great age and high occupations, he be still inclined to shiver a lance in the lists of controversy, we may safely affirm, that his motives are laudable, and trust that his conduct, like his courage, will be fair and honourable.

The Charge, which I purpose to review, was delivered in circumstances peculiarly solemn. It was addressed to the numerous clergy of the diocese of Durham, in a temple dedicated to the worship of the Most High, and from the pulpit, the oracle of truth. On such an occasion, we may justly presume, that no unguarded word would be permitted to drop from the mouth of the learned Prelate. Each assertion would be previously weighed, and

* Thus when the Duke of York asked Archbishop Sheldon, if it were the doctrine of the Church of England, that Roman Catholics were idolaters? he answered, "that it was not; but that young men of parts would be popular, and such a charge was the way to it." Burnet, History of his own times, anno 1673.

its accuracy anxiously ascertained. The erudition of the audience, the sacredness of the place, the sanctity of the episcopal character, demanded that truth and charity should guide and restrain the zeal of the preacher. If, then, in the following pages, I shall have occasion to complain, that the tenets of Catholics have been incorrectly stated, and their practices unfairly described, I would not be understood to impeach the sincerity or veracity of the Bishop of Durham. But while I applaud the uprightness of his intention, I may be allowed to lament the influence of prejudice, which could conceal the truth from his view, and prompt him to study the doctrine of the Catholic Church in the writings of her adversaries. I may regret that he should sometimes condescend to join the company of those misinformed but positive writers, who,

Without the care of knowing right from wrong,
 Always appear decisive, clear, and strong.
 Where others toil with philosophic force,
 Their nimble nonsense takes a shorter course,
 Flings at your head conviction in a lump,
 And gains remote conclusions at a jump.

I am persuaded that the learned author of the Charge will not be offended at the liberty with which I may animadvert on some of his assertions. By assuming the privilege of attack, he has not wished to deprive his opponent of the right of defence. His object was to convince our understandings, and not to wound our feelings; and if we con-

ceive ourselves injured, he will not refuse us the consolation of attempting to prove the justice of our complaints. His love for truth will lead him to recal errors which may have been unintentionally admitted; and his zeal for the established Church will rejoice to learn, that she is descended from a parent less corrupt than he has been taught to imagine.

The Bishop begins his Charge by reminding his Clergy, “ that, at a former meeting, he had
 “ imputed the overthrow of the ancient govern-
 “ ment of France, and all its tremendous conse-
 “ quences, ultimately, to the corruptions of the
 “ Church of Rome, and its wide departure from
 “ the simplicity of the Gospel.”*

Before we subscribe to so disgraceful an accusation, we may be allowed at least to inquire, on what proof it is founded? And the only proof which his Lordship has yet condescended to produce, is briefly this: that the horrors of the French revolution arose from the infidelity of its authors, and that their infidelity is to be ascribed to the corrupt doctrines of the Church in which they were educated. Popery is, in his opinion, the prolific parent of religious indifference, of deism, and of atheism.†

From what period his Lordship will date the origin of Popery (by that word I mean the religi-

* Charge, p. 1.

† Bishop of Durham’s sermon before the lords, 1799, p. 10, et seq.

ous creed of the nations in communion with the Bishop of Rome) I am not able to determine. Catholics maintain, that it is coeval with Christianity; Protestants do not deny it an existence of at least a thousand years. Now, taking it at the lowest computation, is it not extraordinary, if Popery be naturally pregnant with infidelity, that the birth of the monster should have been retarded till the close of the eighteenth century? Even a thousand years are a long period of gestation; and unless the Bishop, with the aid of his prophetic friends, Messrs Faber and Granville Sharpe, can mysteriously account for so late a parturition, I shall be induced to conclude, that he has mistaken the true parent, and ought to recommence the inquiry.

In several French writers of great and acknowledged eminence,* I have met with a very different opinion respecting the origin of deism and atheism. Instead of considering them as the offspring of Popery, they persist in making deism the grandchild, and atheism the great grandchild of Protestantism. According to them, Protestantism begat Socinianism, Socinianism begat deism, and deism begat atheism. The accuracy of this genealogy they have supported with much plausibility; and, by comparing their arguments with those of the Bishop of Durham, the reader will be

* Bergier, *Traite Hist. Dogmat. de la Religion*, vol. 12. *Encycloped. tom. 17. Art. Unitaires.*

able to judge which of the two systems is the more deserving of credit.

The Right Reverend Prelate builds his opinion respecting the origin of infidelity on this basis, "that Popery, from its corruptions, is liable to the objections of thinking men."*. If his reasoning be just, it will naturally follow, that in Catholic countries either the number of thinking men is exceedingly small, or the number of unbelievers immensely great. The latter consequence he adopts in all its latitude, and with much solemnity assures us, "that in the nations in communion with the Church of Rome, both the members of the government and the higher classes of the people are habitually insincere; and have continued for many years to profess the Popish creed, not from any opinion of its evidence, but from an utter indifference to all religious truth whatever."† It would, undoubtedly, be an insult to his candour and liberality, to question the truth of a fact which he thus unequivocally asserts: on his authority then we will endeavour to believe, however improbable it may appear, that for many years all the higher order of foreign Catholics, all who have been eminent for virtue, learning, or rank, Popes, Princes, Statesmen, Nobles, and Prelates, and even the French clergy, who in support of their religion offered themselves to proscription, exile, and death, were habitually insincere, hypocrites,

* Sermon, p. 10.

† Ibid.

sceptics, and unbelievers. This, indeed, to many readers, will appear extraordinary, and, had not the Bishop of Durham asserted it, incredible: but what to me appears more extraordinary and more incredible is, that these thinking men did not, when they discovered the errors of Popery, adopt the pure, rational, unadulterated system of Protestantism. What induced them to prefer to it the absurdities of infidelity? This is a mystery which the bishop has thought it prudent to conceal.

The patrons of the opposite genealogy, are accustomed to appeal in favour of their opinion to the testimony of history. They maintain that infidelity did not publicly appear till after the commencement of the reformation, and that all its apostles, with perhaps one or two exceptions, proceeded, during more than two centuries, from the ranks of Protestantism. They observe that the very principle, which introduced the Reformation, naturally leads in its consequences to religious scepticism. The rights of reason were extolled at the expence of those of revelation. Each individual was made, for himself at least, the sole judge in matters of religion. His private reason became a tribunal from which no appeal was permitted. The effect of this doctrine was soon manifest; and the fathers of the Reformation saw, with the keenest regret, their own weapons turned against themselves by their own children. It was in vain that Calvin burnt Servetus at Geneva, and that Gentilis shortly after lost his head

in the same city. Long before the close of the sixteenth century, a sect of innovators had established themselves in Poland, who judging, like their masters, of the sense of Scripture by the infallibility of their own reason, presumed to reject all the mysteries of christianity, because they were unable to comprehend them. Their opinions were gradually disseminated through the other kingdoms of Europe, and in most of the Protestant states found a soil the best adapted to their culture. In England, the proselytes to the new doctrines were numerous; and though the fires of Smithfield, in the reigns of Edward, Elizabeth, and James, blazed in support of the tenets of the established church, Socinianism continued to make a steady and certain progress. Among its abettors, however, there were many, whose reason was uneasy even under the small restraint which it imposed. They at length condemned the timidity of their teachers, and, arguing from the same principles, proved that the Scriptures themselves ought to be rejected. If it were the right of reason to decide, what necessity, they asked, could there be for revelation? A new system, known by the name of natural religion, was recommended, and its partizans distinguished themselves by the appellation of Deists*. Yet, even in natural religion, much was discovered that the human intellect could not comprehend; and the mysteries were, in their turn, exploded by

* See Hume, Hist. c. 71.

reasoners of greater intrepidity; and deism in a few years was improved into atheism.

The first who claimed the merit of forming deism into a complete system, was our countryman, Lord Herbert of Cherbury. He published his first treatise on the subject in 1624. But he was not long permitted to enjoy the monopoly of infidelity. The praise which he had obtained, or the benevolent design of illuminating the ignorance of mankind, induced a crowd of writers to offer their discoveries also to the public. Hobbes entered on the career in 1650, Blount in 1680, Toland in 1698, Lord Shaftesbury in 1711, Collins in 1713, Woolston in 1727, Tindal in 1730, Morgan in 1737, and Hume in 1742. By their posthumous works, published in 1748 and 1754, Chubb and Lord Bolingbroke appeared as champions in the same cause. The singularity of the opinions which these writers maintained, gave them a momentary reputation; their works were industriously read, and sometimes translated by foreigners acquainted with the language; and the principles of deism were by degrees adopted by gay, profligate, and unthinking men in France and the north of Germany. The French and German infidels were the mere echoes of their English masters.

Whatever the Bishop of Durham may think of this genealogy, he must at least acknowledge, that religious scepticism has flourished as much in the Protestant as in the Catholic states; and, if he persist in attributing its progress in the latter

to the corruptions of the national religion, he must not complain if we attribute it in the former to a similar cause. As to the French revolution, that much of its horrors was the work of the French deists, is perhaps true. As the scum ascends to the surface, so, during the momentary phrenzy of the revolution, they rose to the head of the government, and improved the opportunity to attempt the destruction of religious order. But their conduct shewed that, far from thinking, with the Bishop of Durham, that catholicity was favourable to their projects, they treated it as their natural and most formidable enemy.* The German deists have never been placed in a similar situation; but there can be little doubt, that much of the indecision, perfidy, and injustice, which for a while, made the Prussian government the wonder and the scorn of Europe, was owing to the deistical and atheistical principles on which it was founded. Both French and Germans have already received their reward.

After all, it appears, that the Bishop does the English Catholics the honour to think less unfavourably of them than of their brethren on the

* " If catholicity be congenial to atheism, and favourable to the propagation of impiety, as some of our Protestant countrymen have asserted, the very incongenial and unfavourable manner in which atheism and impiety have treated their good ally, are circumstances so paradoxical, that I think no ingenuity but their own can either penetrate or explain them." *Reflections on the Spirit of Controversy*, p. 208.—To those who wish to see a more ample discussion on the subject, I would recommend the perusal of this acute and animated publication.

Continent. There Popery makes deists, here it makes zealots. Had he believed us, as he has represented the foreign Catholics to be, indifferent to all religious truth whatever, he would not have thought it necessary to sound the tocsin of alarm, and to animate the zeal of his clergy against us. I am sorry we cannot thank him. Better were it for us, would he, would the more bigoted part of our countrymen, form of us as unjust a notion as of the foreign Catholics; then, perhaps, like them, we might be permitted not only to shed our blood, but also to attain preferment in the armies of our country.* Then perhaps, as well as Jews, deists, and atheists, we might aspire to places of trust, emolument, and rank, and obtain the privileges for which our fathers fought, and which are the birth-right of every Englishman.

There is something ingenious, though quaint, in the manner in which the Right Reverend Prelate has marshaled his objections to what he conceives to be the Catholic creed. He affects to interest in his quarrel the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity; and very prudently places them in the front of the battle. “The doctrines and ordi-

* In 1804, a law was passed without opposition, enabling his majesty to grant, at his discretion, all military commissions whatever to foreign catholics, though they had not disclaimed the erroneous tenets unjustly imputed to their religion: in 1807, an act was proposed to enable his majesty to grant similar favours to English catholics, who have disclaimed such tenets, and it was refused, and the nation was thrown into a ferment, as if both the throne and the church were in danger!

“ nances of the Church of Rome are,” as he affirms, “ derogatory

- “ 1. From the honour of God the Father ;
- “ 2. From the mediatorship of the Son ; and
- “ 3. From the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit.”*

These are certainly bold assertions, and if he can prove them by argument, I shall not be surprised at his enmity to the Catholic, or his attachment to the Protestant faith.

1. That the Church of Rome derogates from the honour of God the Father, he infers from the second precept of the Decalogue ; *Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath.* “ It is in vain,” he tells us, “ to alledge, “ that images are used as the aids and not the “ objects of devotion. It is impossible to preserve “ the distinction in the minds of the people. “ Abuse is unavoidable. Idolatry is the inevitable consequence.”† In favour of this accusation, so unfounded in fact, so injurious to the feelings of a people as zealous for the honour of God as the Bishop of Durham himself, the only thing that can be said is, that it has been often and ve-

* Charge, p. 10.

† Ibid. p. 11.

hemently urged by the adversaries of the Church of Rome. It has also been often and victoriously refuted: but, probably, the reading of the Bishop has been principally confined to our accusers, and has been seldom extended to our apologists. The opinions, which in his youth he imbibed from the bigotry and prejudice of Controvertists, he still cherishes in his old age, and condemns us as idolaters, when he might any day, by an easy experiment, convince himself of the falsity of the accusation. Let him interrogate the first Catholic child of ten years of age, whom he may chance to meet in the streets, whether it be lawful to worship images? and he will receive for answer: “No, “by no means; for they can neither hear, nor “see, nor help us.”* This is the lesson which is impressed on our minds in our infancy: and it is so consonant to religion and common sense, that, I believe, it is never effaced. I may certainly claim a more extensive acquaintance with Catholics than the Bishop of Durham; but I never yet met with any so ignorant, as to pay adoration to either images or pictures.

The Bishop proceeds to observe, that this practice “is repugnant to the letter of God’s commandments.”† But, as to the letter of the commandments, it may be observed, that the practice of Catholics is not more repugnant to it than the practice of Protestants. Taken literally, the com-

* Cath. Catechism, I. Command.

† Charge, p. 12.

mandments prohibit, without exception or qualification, the making of any graven thing, or the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or on the earth beneath. If we are to be judged by the letter of the law, let our adversaries submit to the same trial; and let the Bishop of Durham justify, if he can, the graven things, and the likenesses of things in heaven above, and on the earth beneath, which still exist in his cathedral. It was formerly ornamented by the ingenuity of the sculptor and the painter: and of these ornaments, if many have been effaced by the Gothic fanaticism of the first reformers, many are still preserved by the pious care of their posterity. Aware of this difficulty, he has prudently inserted in *his* edition of the commandment, the words, “for the purpose of religious worship;” an explanation which I cordially approve, as it perfectly agrees with the Catholic doctrine. “This commandment,” says our Catechism, “forbids the making of images so as to adore and serve them: that is, it forbids making them our Gods.” If then Catholics be idolaters, tell me, what is the Bishop of Durham?

“To us,” he continues, “it cannot be surprising, that the same superstition which could induce any one to believe that bread and wine (mere bodily elements, of earthly manufacture) were converted into the real body and blood of

* Charge, p. 11.

“ Christ, should without much difficulty worshi.
 “ a creature image instead of the Creator.”* In this eloquent passage, dictated by moderation and liberality itself, I have long been at a loss what to admire the most, the politeness of the expression, or the acuteness of the reasoning. The Catholic intellect, it seems, is, in the opinion of the Bishop of Durham, deeply and incurably diseased. The belief of the real presence is a kind of original sin, which vitiates all the faculties of the mind, deprives it of the power of distinguishing truth from falsehood, and prepares it for the reception of every absurdity. It is in vain that the Catholic may appeal to the express words of Christ: *This is my body*; in vain that he urge his adversary to adduce in support of any other tenet, words equally plain and significative: in vain that he advert to the consentient belief of all other Christian Churches on the face of the globe. It is a superstition, replies his lordship; its professors must be idolaters; there can be little difficulty with them to worship a creature image instead of the creator.

The Right Reverend Theologian has thus laid down the law: his candour certainly will not refuse to be tried by it. He believes, according to the creed of his church, that Christ was truly God but he cannot be ignorant, that several writers in this country, and those too men of talents and erudition, have maintained that he was a mere man.

* Ibid.

Now, were one of these to observe, that the same superstition (they think it so) which could induce the Bishop of Durham to believe that a person, clothed in the same flesh, and subject to the same infirmities as ourselves, was the very God who framed the heavens and the earth, might, with equal facility, persuade him to worship the creature image for the Creator: were this remark to be made, I could wish to learn what would be his reply. Would he cite the texts which, in his opinion, establish the divinity of the Messiah? The Catholic, with equal justice, may cite those, which as evidently establish the real presence. Would he argue, that because you conceive the opinion of your adversary to be erroneous, you have no right to accuse him of other erroneous opinions which he disavows? The Catholic may make the same reply. In this respect, the Catholic and the Bishop of Durham stand on the same ground. I do not mean to infer that he is an idolater; but I am anxious to know how, while he maintain the justness of his own reasoning, he will prove that he is not.—Again, it appears that the learned Prelate *disbelieves* the real existence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper: and at the same time, as a true child of the Church of England, *believes* them to be received *verily* and *indeed* by the faithful. Now, to me, this doctrine of receiving that which *does not really exist*, has always appeared something like a paradox. Yet far be it from me to infer, even though I should be autho-

rized by his Lordship's conduct, that because on this subject he speaks what to me seems nonsense, he therefore is accustomed to talk nonsense on other occasions.

“ To disguise such repugnance,” observes the Charge, “ an artifice was adopted in Romish books of religious institution, as contrary to the honour of God, as image worship itself. In the enumeration of the ten commandments the second is wholly suppressed, and the number ten completed by dividing the tenth into two : and this in direct violation of the injunction : *Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you ; neither shall ye diminish aught from it.*”^{*} I am astonished that so grave and discreet a Prelate should have hazarded so dangerous an assertion. Had he opened a Catholic Bible, Catholic Prayer Book, or Catholic Catechism, he would have found this commandment expressed in the same words as in Protestant books of religious institution.† He would have learned that the De-

^{*} Charge, page 12.

† I consider the *graven image* of the Protestant as equivalent to the *graven thing* of the Catholic translation. The latter is perhaps more comprehensive. As for the division of the Decalogue, it is in itself a matter of inferior consequence. The whole number of precept and prohibitory clauses is fourteen : and to reduce these into ten divisions has been the subject of different systems both among Jews and Christians. The division, which for many centuries has been adopted by Catholics, is that recommended by St Augustine. It is therefore unjust to represent it as an artifice to disguise an unlawful practice.

calogue in both was the same; that the only difference consisted in the division: and that the Reformers had been pleased to separate the first precept into two, and to condense the ninth and tenth into one. He would not have advanced an assertion, which, had it come from any other person than the Bishop of Durham, I should not hesitate to pronounce an insult to the credulity of the public, and a cruel calumny against the consciences of Catholics. Do I then impeach the veracity of his Lordship? No, I doubt not, that what he asserted, he also believed to be true. Do I accuse his ignorance? I do: he ought to have known better.

2. To prove that the usages of the Church of Rome were injurious to the honour of God the Son, the writer of the Charge instances the custom of "praying to the Virgin Mary, to Angels, and "to Saints."* To pray to the Angels and Saints is, in the language of the Catholic Church, to solicit their intercession, and is recommended by her as a pious and useful practice. But is it evident, as asserted by the Bishop of Durham, that it derogates from the one mediatorship of Jesus Christ? The inference to me is illogical and unjust. With him

* Charge, p. 15.—How different is this doctrine from that of Dr Montague, bishop of Norwich. "I grant," says he, "Christ is not wronged in his mediation. It is no impiety to say: "Holy Mary pray for me. Holy Peter pray for me,"—Treatise on the Invocation of Saints, p. 118.

I am ready to acknowledge, that there is one only name under heaven, whereby we must be saved; that there is one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus: that he ever liveth to make intercession for us; that he is our intercessor with the Father; and that through him we have access by one spirit unto the Father.* But does it necessarily follow, that it is unlawful to desire others to intercede for us with Christ, and through his merits? Did not the Apostle St Paul beg the prayers of the Romans, Corinthians, and Ephesians? Does not the Church of England command her ministers to pray for the king, the high court of parliament, the clergy, and men of every condition? Does not Dr Porteus exhort “every sincere christian to persevere in that most benevolent office of INTERCEDING for all mankind?”† Certainly the Bishop of Durham will not contend that the Apostle was ignorant of the mediatorship of Jesus, or that he himself, when he complies with the orders of his church, “detracts from the all-sufficiency of our Saviour;” or that his right reverend brother does not know that “Christ liveth to make intercession for us.” Yet, if to

* Charge, p. *ibid.*—Apprehensive of incurring the curse, which the Bishop of Durham (p. 12.) informs us hangs over the head of him, who adds to the word of God, I have not ventured in quoting these texts, to improve them, as he has done, by the occasional insertion of the word ALONE.

† Sermons by Bielby Porteus, Bishop of London, vol. ii. p. 581.

employ the intercession of a third person be to derogate from the mediatorship of Christ; I cannot understand what difference it can make, whether that person be still living, or numbered with the blessed. The Catholic, like the Protestant, expects salvation from the merits of Christ only; from the Saints he asks neither grace nor salvation; he only solicits their friendly intercession for him with Christ, who is his and their Saviour, his and their God.*

The Bishop of Durham is not, perhaps, aware how easily his reasoning may be turned against himself. As a specimen, I will undertake to

After this explication of the Catholic doctrine respecting the invocation of the Saints, I may venture to ask the right reverend theologian, whether he really thinks it idolatrous? I am not so sanguine as to expect that he will give it his approbation: but, if he be not convinced that it amounts to idolatry, I could wish to learn how he can with a safe conscience make the following declaration, before he takes his seat in the House of Lords: "I do solemnly and sincerely in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe—that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, as *now* used in the Church of Rome, is superstitious and idolatrous." That to adore the Virgin Mary, or any saint, would be idolatry, is evident; but no such adoration is used in the Church of Rome. The invocation of the Saints is indeed used in the sense explained in the text; but such invocation is certainly not idolatrous. It seems to have been reserved for the wisdom of this enlightened nation to make it a necessary qualification for a legislator, that he should be able to swear to the idolatrous nature of a practice, which the majority of Christians declare not to be idolatrous, and which he has probably never viewed but through the deceitful medium of controversial misrepresentation.

prove that the practices of the Church of England are derogatory from the honor of God, and my reasoning shall be an exact parody of his. In the collect for the feast of St. Michael, she prays, that, “the holy angels may, by God’s appointment, succour and defend us on earth :” a petition which detracts from the all-sufficiency of God’s providence, and teaches the people to place their confidence in the angels, who are God’s creatures, rather than in God their creator. “God *alone*, (I have as good a right to insert the word *alone* as the Bishop of Durham) God alone is our rock, our fortress, and our deliverer : he alone is a rock to save us ; he alone is the saving strength of his anointed, our help and our shield ; the salvation of the righteous is of the Lord alone.” The practice therefore of the Church of England, in multiplying succourers and defenders, detracts greatly from the providence of God, and leads to a communication of the divine attributes to beings who are creatures and servants like ourselves. This reasoning I acknowledge to be futile : but I have learned it from the Bishop of Durham ; and he must either admit it, or abjure his own Charge.

“But the imposition of penances, as purchases of pardon, and remedies of past sin, was a denial of the efficacy of the great sacrifice which Christ made for us by his death.”* I must con-

* Charge, page 15.

fess myself at a loss to understand the meaning of the term, “ purchases of pardon.” It is unknown in Catholic theology, and has been probably framed by the inventive genius of the Reformation. If by it the Bishop of Durham wish to insinuate, that Catholics teach works of penance to be of themselves a sufficient compensation for sin, he has still to learn the first rudiments of our doctrine. If he mean, that we consider them as one of the conditions on which Christ is willing to communicate the merits of his passion to the soul of the sinner, his meaning is just, though his expression be inaccurate. But does he seriously condemn this doctrine, founded as it is on the clearest evidence of scripture, and confirmed by the practice of the most early ages? If I understand his reasoning, he does. He is the zealous champion of the all-sufficiency of Christ: and, in his opinion, to do penance for sin after the great sacrifice consummated on the cross, is to offer an injury to the honour of God the Son, and to deny the efficacy of his passion. His creed must, at least, be a very consoling one. *Indulge your passions*, it exclaims to the sinner, *indulge your passions now, and cease to sin, when you can sin no longer. Fear not the rigours of penance. To weep and pray, to fast and give alms, to repent in sackcloth and ashes, were external ceremonies confined to the Jewish dispensation. To practise them now, would be to “ seduce* “ from the grace and truth that came by Jesus “ Christ,—to carry us back from the Gospel to

“ the Law,—to deprive ourselves of the inestimable advantages which the law of Moses could not give us.”* It is curious to observe how much the Gospel, which is preached in these enlightened times, has improved on the rough sketch that was delivered to our fathers. St Paul was accustomed to keep under his body, and to bring it into subjection.† I have no doubt that he thought he was acting in a manner pleasing to Christ, and yet we now learn from the Bishop of Durham, that he was actually derogating from the efficacy of the passion of Christ. The penitents, in ancient times, often spent whole years in works of penance. They fasted and prayed; they lay prostrate at the porch of the church; they solicited the intercession of their less guilty brethren.‡ By these austerities they hoped they were fulfilling the will of their Redeemer: but now, we know, that they were adding sin to sin, and augmenting the guilt of their former offences, by denying the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ. Even the learned men, who compiled the Book of Common Prayer, seem to have been involved in this damnable error. “ There was formerly,” they tell us, “ a godly discipline, that at the beginning of

* Charge, p. 14.

† *Υποπιναζω* I chastise or tame. The learned Prelate will excuse me, if, notwithstanding his prohibition, I appeal to the Greek text.

‡ Bingham, Orig. Eccles. Tom. 11. p. 207.

“ Lent, such persons as stood convicted of notorious sins, were put to open penance, and punished here, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord. And it were much to be wished that the said discipline may be restored again.”* Little did they imagine, that this godly discipline of penance and punishment, by means of which the souls of sinners were to be saved in the day of the Lord, would be proved by one of their successors in the ministry, to be an impiety, derogatory from the mediatorship of the Redeemer. Yet so, (if I can understand his meaning) says the Bishop of Durham; and he is a master of Israel.†

The writer of the Charge has a third argument in reserve to prove his accusation. “ The Roman Church denies the use of the cup to the Laity at the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper: which is derogatory from the honour of our Saviour, as it is a violation of his express command: Drink ye *all* of this. It is not only an unjust infringement of the rights of the Laity, and a daring mutilation of the holy sacrament, but also dishonours him who instituted and ordained it.”‡ It is with regret I notice these bold assertions, which cannot be supported by

* Book of Common Prayer.

† I could wish to know what is the meaning of the Fast Day, ordered by the King, every year. Is it not considered as a work of penance?

‡ Charge, p. 15.

argument. So learned a Prelate as the Bishop of Durham knew, or ought to have known, that the custom of communicating under one kind, is sanctioned not only by the practice of the Latin, but also of the Greek Church, on several days of the year; and he should have hesitated before he condemned on his own private authority nine tenths of the great body of Christians, as violators of the command of Christ, and mutilators of the sacrament. He knew, or ought to have known, that some of the most eminent writers of the Church of England have maintained, that communion under both kinds was not commanded by Christ,* and that the Synod of French Protestants holden at Poitiers in 1560, decreed that only the bread of the Lord's Supper ought to be administered to those who cannot drink wine.† He knew, or ought to have known, that the manner of communicating is a mere matter of discipline, which may vary according to times and circumstances: that the use of the cup has been sometimes granted and sometimes denied to the Laity; and that the communion has on some occasions, been lawfully ad-

* Bishop Montague, *Orig.* Tom. 1. p. 396.

† Chap. 13, Art. 7.—For instances of communion under one kind among the eastern nations, see Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orient. Collect.* Tom. 11. p. 123, 370. Arcudius, *de Concord. Eccl. Occident. et Orient.* p. 382, 396. Among the Cophts it is the custom to communicate children under one kind, by dipping the finger into the chalice, and then putting it into their mouths. Renaudot, Tom. 1. p. 291.

ministered under the sole form of bread, and on others, under the sole form of wine.* The Apostles, it is true, communicated under both kinds. But would he bind us to imitate every particular of their communion? Then we, (I mean the men only, for as no women were present they will be excluded,) must receive in the evening, after supper, and sitting at table. Will he maintain that all Christ's words were at that time directed to all the faithful? Then every individual may claim the right of consecrating the elements. Some distinction must be drawn, and as the scripture is silent, we must have recourse to the practice and authority of the Church of Christ.—But did not our Saviour say: “Drink ye *all* of this.†” I answer, 1. That from St Mark it appears, “they *all* drank of it:” whence it may be inferred, that the command of Christ was addressed not to the whole body of Christians, but to all present, that is, to the twelve apostles on whom he then conferred the power of consecrating the eucharist. 2. That the practice of the Christian Church is a sufficient explanation of the meaning of her divine

* From the expression of St Paul, it appears that the communion was sometimes administered under one kind in the most early times. Whosoever shall eat this bread, *or* drink this cup, 1 Cor. xi. 27. But for this reading I must refer the bishop to his Palladium, the Greek text: *Ὁς ἀν εὐθιῇ τὸν ἀρτόν, τῦτον, ἢ πινὼν τὸ ποτήριον.* The English Protestant translators have thought proper to transform the disjunctive *or* into the copulative *and*.

† Charge, p. 15.

Master. Nor is this a principle which the Bishop of Durham can consistently reject. From the expressions of scripture, and the practice of the first christians, it is evident that the sacrament of baptism was, in its first institution, conferred by immersion: yet what Protestant clergyman hesitates at the present day to adopt the contrary method of aspersion or affusion? Christ forbade his disciples to swear at all: yet, does not the Bishop of Durham permit oaths to be taken in his courts, to the no small emolument of his officers? Christ commanded his disciples, after his example, to wash the feet of each other: yet who is there at the present day that complies with this injunction? The Apostles, in the Council of Jerusalem, declared that to abstain from blood was a necessary thing: yet what Christian scruples now to transgress that prohibition? For these, and several other deviations from the exact letter of the scripture, no other satisfactory reason can be given, than the authority of the Pastors of the Church, whom Christ has established the interpreters of his law. Since then communion under one kind has for several centuries been established, and was always partially admitted, the Bishop of Durham will excuse us, if, in defiance of his censure, and in obedience to an authority, to which he himself must bend on other occasions, we continue to adhere to our ancient custom, without conceiving that we either transgress the command, or dishonour the

mediatorship of Christ.—As to the reproach of mutilation, it may with equal justice be retorted on the Protestant. He condemns the Catholic for mutilating the sacrament—Of what? Of a cup of mere wine. The Catholic condemns him for mutilating it of its very essence, the body and blood of Christ.

3. We now proceed to the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. From these, we are told, the Church of Rome derogates by “the great stress which she lays on external and ritual performances:” a stress which “tends to lessen the spirituality of religious duties, and teaches the mind to rest on outward and carnal observances, instead of placing its whole trust on Christ’s promised assistance of the Holy Spirit, and the sufficiency of his grace.”* To this vague and general accusation, I scarcely know what answer to oppose. The Bishop, before he ventured to condemn, should at least have condescended to explain the doctrine of the Catholics on the subject of ritual observances. He should have pointed out in what it differed from that of the Church of England†, and have shewn, not by

* Charge, p. 15.

† “The church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies.” Articles of the Church of England, Art. 20. “The prescribing stated forms for the several acts of religious worship, and not leaving that to the capacities or humours, to the inventions, and often to the extravagancies of those who are to officiate, fall within

mere assertion, but by facts, that it was pernicious in its consequences. This would have been fair and manly. It would have enabled his readers to judge of *its* merits, and of *his* censure. He has, however, thought proper to adopt a different method, more convenient, it is true, to the writer, but certainly more calculated to mislead the judgment of the reader. He has described the Catholic doctrine in terms the most loose and indefinite, which may mean any thing or nothing, and which convey no precise idea to the mind, but envelope the object in a mist through which it is seen magnified and distorted. As, then, I cannot ascertain the exact meaning of the accusation, I hope I may be excused from attempting to refute it: but be that meaning what it may, I strenuously deny the inference which the Bishop has deduced from it; and maintain that the conduct of Catholics, however they may be attached to external ceremonies, is not such as to justify the assertion, that they are more hostile than their neighbours to the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. As to ritual performances, I know

the general rules given by the apostles to the churches in their time. . . . We ought to acquiesce in such rules as have been agreed on by common consent; and which are recommended to us by long practice, and that are established by those who have the lawful authority over us. Nor can we assign any other bounds to our submission in this case than those the gospel has limited. We must obey God rather than man." Exposition of the 59 articles, by Gilbert, bishop of Sarum, p. 193, 194.

not what place they may hold in the estimation of the Bishop of Durham. If he reject them, I fear he knows little of human nature. In religion they are necessary to attract curiosity, stimulate languor, and fix attention. The experience of ages shews, that, without them, every profession of religious worship, though it may be kept alive by the cordials of wealth and distinction, must yet subside into a state of torpor and indifference. If the zealous Prelate wish for a spiritual religion, he may congratulate himself on the completion of his wish. With the general state of the diocese of Durham, I cannot be so well acquainted as his Lordship; but if it resemble that of the other dioceses in this kingdom, there are few, very few, Protestants, whose minds rest on outward and carnal observances. The solitude of the churches testifies, that if they worship at all, they worship in spirit alone. They may indeed perform their religious duties in a spiritual and invisible manner; corporal attendance, and external observance, they certainly disdain.*

* The Bishop of London, in his Charge for 1790 (p. 11.) very truly observes: "Scarcely one symptom of religion ever appears amongst us except on the Lord's day." He might have added, and very few even then. "It must be acknowledged," says he in another place, "that the present remarkable thinness of our churches on Sundays, at the east as well as the west end of the town, is a proof that the neglect of divine worship is not confined to the great, but has pervaded almost every class of people in this capital." Sermons, vol. i. p. 212.

“ But,” resumes the writer of the Charge, “ the
 “ sacred influence of the Holy Ghost was still
 “ more dishonoured by the presumptuous doc-
 “ trines which were maintained concerning the
 “ merit of good works.”* This is another vague
 and indeterminate accusation, from which I should
 be inclined to suspect that the Bishop of Durham
 is not better acquainted with the doctrine of the
 Catholic Church respecting good works, than with
 the other parts of her religious creed. May I
 then be allowed to inform him of that which is fa-
 miliar to every Catholic from his childhood ? We
 are taught, 1. That the Scripture perpetually in-
 culcates the utility of good works. *What doth it*
profit, says St James, though a man say he hath
faith, and have not works ? Can faith save him ?
If faith have not works, it is dead, being alone.
By works a man is justified, and not by faith only.†
 St Paul prayed that his converts might walk
 worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruit-
 ful in every *good work* : and that Christ might
 comfort their hearts, and establish them in every
good word and work.‡ He advises those who have
 believed in God, to be careful to maintain *good*
works ; and charges the rich, that they do good,
 that they be rich in *good works*, that they may lay
 hold on eternal life.§ 2. We believe that a re-

* Charge, p. 15.

† St James ii. 14, 17, 24.

‡ Coloss. i. 10. 2 Thess. ii. 17.

§ Tit. iii. 8. 1 Tim. vi. 18. See also Gal. vi. 9. 2 Thess.
 iii. 13.

ward has been promised to the performance of good works. *Love ye your enemies, and do good, and your reward shall be great. God will render to every man according to his deeds: to them, who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life. There is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them that love his appearing.** 3. Hence, though with the Bishop of Durham, we acknowledge ourselves to be unprofitable servants, though it be the Holy Spirit that worketh in us, both to will and to do of his good pleasure, yet, as God is faithful to his promises, and not unrighteous to forget our work and labour of love, we piously trust he will fulfil his engagements, and reward with his glory in heaven the works which by his grace (for grace is necessary) he has enabled us to perform upon earth. This is the Catholic doctrine respecting the merit of good works; and it is so very consonant to reason and religion, that I conceive the mere explanation of it will silence every objection.†

* Luke vi. 35. Rom. ii. 6, 7. 2 Tim. iv. 8.

† Besides the Bishop of Durham, the Bishop of London is also in the habit of delivering lectures from the pulpit. He seems to think that, though Christ has paid our ransom, yet good works are necessary for us, and that to perform them is not to deny the efficacy of his passion. "All these sacrifices," says he, "must be made. It is the price we are to pay (besides that

Thus have I endeavoured to answer, and I trust with some success, the principal arguments of my Right Reverend opponent. But he has added a few exceptions, of minor consequence it is true, but which ought not to escape without notice. Of these, the first is the old tale of indulgences. To the apprehension of many of my readers, I have no doubt that an indulgence appears a monster of most hideous aspect, engendered from clerical avarice and popular credulity. But, if they will have a little patience, I hope to convince them that it is a being of a most harmless nature. In ancient

“ price which our Redeemer paid), and surely no unreasonable
 “ one, for escaping eternal misery, and rendering ourselves capa-
 “ ble of eternal glory.” Lectures on St. Matt. lect. vi. p. 143.
 In another place he perfectly agrees with the Catholic doctrine of
 good works. “ Our heavenly father expects and commands us
 “ to be rich in *good works*, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked,
 “ &c’”. Lect. xviii. p. 165. Nor do I believe that he has the
 same opinion as the Bishop of Durham on the subject of cere-
 monies. He calls those “ enthusiasts who trample under foot
 “ ancient ceremonies and institutions.” Lect. viii. p. 199. Let the
 two prelates mutually reconcile their respective creeds, in points
 of such importance so diametrically opposite to each other. Bishop
 Watson, as Regius Professor of Divinity in the university of Cam-
 bridge, has published a collection of theological tracts, among
 which is a treatise entitled a Key to the Apostolic Writings (vol. iii.
 p. 515.) I do not conceive in what the doctrine delivered in this
 tract respecting the necessity of good works differs from that of
 Catholics. Thus, p. 591, he says, “ We are to go through a course
 “ of well-doing in order to our reaping eternal life; which we
 “ shall not obtain, if we faint, or are weary in well-doing. The
 “ doctrine which teaches us the performance of all good works
 “ is the sound, uncorrupt doctrine of the gospel.” P. 401.

times, as we have seen already, the sinner who by public crimes had afflicted the zeal of his more innocent brethren, was subjected to a course of public penance, which was not confined to the duration of a few weeks, but frequently extended to several years, sometimes to the whole life of the offender. The bishops, however, claimed the power of abridging the time, or mitigating the severity of the punishment, as the fervour and circumstances of the penitent might require: and this abridgment or mitigation was termed an indulgence. On some occasions they commuted, according to their discretion, a part of the penance, into other pious works, such as the giving of alms, assisting in the erection of churches, and contributing towards charitable institutions. These commutations are what the Bishop of Durham has called the sale of indulgences. Now, it is proper to observe, that this kind of discipline was not peculiar to the Church of Rome: it was adopted by other churches, and has even been adopted by the established Church in England. As a proof of the assertion, the curious reader may peruse the following writing of Archbishop Grindall, laid before the synod of the province of Canterbury in 1580, and approved by that assembly. “I wish,” says he, “at every public penance a sermon, if it be possible to be had. . . . Let the offender be set directly over against the pulpit during the service or homily, and there stand bareheaded with the sheet or other accustomed note of difference,

“ and that upon a board raised a foot and a half at
 “ least above the church floor, that they may be
 “ in a higher place, and above all the people.”
 He then directs the preacher to interrogate the
 penitent, whether he confess that by his crimes
 he has deserved everlasting damnation, and offend-
 ed the church of God ; whether he be heartily
 sorry ; whether he ask God and the congregation,
 forgiveness ; and whether he promise never to
 commit the like again ? To these questions answers
 are to be returned in the affirmative. He then
 continues : “ Provided always that order be given
 “ by the ordinaries, when they assign penances,
 “ that if the penitents do shew shemselves irreve-
 “ rent, or impenitent at their penances, that then
 “ their punishments be reiterated, and be remov-
 “ ed from the church to the market-place. . . .
 “ If the ordinary see cause to *commute* the wearing
 “ of the sheet only, (for other commutation I wish
 “ none) then appoint a *good portion of money* to
 “ be delivered immediately after the penance done,
 “ in form aforesaid, by the penitent himself, to
 “ the collectors of the poor, with this proviso, that
 “ if he shew not good signs of repentance, he is to
 “ be put again into his penance with the sheet, and
 “ then no money at no time to be taken of him.”*
 Here then we have a Protestant commutation of
 penance, sanctioned by the approbation of the
 Church of England, and, in the language of the

* Wilkins, Concil. Tom. iv. p. 298.

Bishop of Durham, a Protestant sale of indulgences. By both churches, the monies arising from this source were destined for pious purposes : both had occasionally to lament that their intentions were not faithfully fulfilled. From the numerous complaints made in the convocations of the years 1584, 1597, 1599, 1640, 1710, 1714, it appears, that the fines which were thus paid to the Protestant clergy of England amounted to no inconsiderable sum, which the avarice of the collectors frequently tempted them to divert from the proper channel into their own private purses. To remedy this abuse, canons were framed, which do honour to the zeal of their authors. It was decreed, that the power of granting these commutations should be taken from the inferior clergy, and confined to the bishops and their delegates ; that the officers of the ordinary should be contented with their accustomed fees ; that the ordinary himself should inspect the distribution of the money, and annually audit the accounts ; and that the transgressors of these regulations should be suspended from their functions during three months, or a whole year.*

From this view of the subject, it follows that the sale of indulgences, if sale it must be called, was common to the clergy of the Protestant as well as of the Catholic church ; and the impartial reader, while he condemns the avarice of those who may have converted this practice to their private emolu-

* Ibid. p. 315, 355, 362, 552, 638, 654.

ment, will acquit each of the two churches, because each in her public canons expressed the highest disapprobation of so heinous an abuse. I shall only add, that the Bishop of Durham ought to be no enemy to indulgences : for his doctrine, that works of penance are a denial of the efficacy of Christ's passion, offers to sinners a more extensive indulgence, than any Pope, in the plenitude of his power, has yet ventured to grant.

He next reprehends the adoption of an unknown tongue in the public services of religion.* I conceive he means in the celebration of the liturgy, as he knows that the Catholic priests read prayers, and deliver instructions to the people, in the English language. It cannot be necessary, that I repeat the arguments by which the Catholic divines have defended a custom consecrated in their eyes by the approbation of so many centuries. If the Bishop of Durham conceive himself and his colleagues the most proper judges of the language which is best adapted to their service, I hope he will allow the same privilege to the Catholic Prelates with respect to theirs. The English Church is a modern church ; its language therefore should be modern, that its liturgy may announce to posterity the æra in which it was framed. But the Church of Rome is an ancient church : it therefore preserves its ancient liturgy, the language of which remounts to the origin of Christianity. I do not believe that history can furnish an instance

* Charge, p. 16.

of a people, who ever changed the language of their liturgy, and did not at the same time change their religion. The Christians of the Latin rite are not singular in the use of an ancient tongue in their service. The Greeks, Russians, Armenians, Syrians, Cophts, Ethiopians, Georgians, and the other Christians of the East, all retain the liturgies which they received from the fathers of their faith, and which are written in languages unintelligible to the vulgar. The same was the discipline of the Jews after the captivity; nor do we learn that it was ever blamed by our Saviour. Neither is it true, that the modern Church of England has always held in such abhorrence the celebration of the divine service in an unknown tongue. In the year 1560, an Act was passed for the introduction of the English Book of Common Prayer among the natives of Ireland, who were compelled by the severest penalties to assist at the celebration of the English liturgy, though they were utterly unacquainted with the language.* Nor do the English Prelates appear to have always been enemies to the Latin tongue. In the Act of Uniformity, the reformed minister in Ireland, if he could not read

* Heylin, Hist. of the Reform, Eliz. p. 128. "The people by that statute are required under several penalties to frequent their churches, and to be frequent at the reading of the English liturgy, which they understand no more than they do the mass . . . by which we have furnished the Papists with an excellent argument against ourselves, for having the divine service celebrated in such a language as the people do not understand."—
Ibid.

English, was permitted to read a Latin translation, which probably was equally understood by his parishioners:* and in the same year, the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the colleges of Eton and Winchester, obtained permission from the head of their church to perform the divine service in the language of Rome.†

“ But,” observes the writer of the Charge, “ the Scriptures themselves were, at the time of the Reformation, removed from the reach of the common enquirer, and concealed in the obscurity of an unknown language.”‡ Certainly the Bishop of Durham cannot be ignorant that the art of printing was then in its infancy, and the art of reading confined of consequence, almost exclusively, to the learned. Would he then have had the Catholic Prelates to publish versions of the Scriptures for the very rational purpose of putting them into the hands of those who could not read ?

He proceeds to describe the Catholic Church as an enemy to biblical learning, and to the study of the languages in which the Scriptures were originally written. To the truth of this assertion I cannot subscribe ; its refutation has been already anticipated by many Protestant writers.§ The

* Ibid.

† Wilk. Conc. Tom. iv. p. 217.

‡ Charge, p. 17.

§ “ A single Benedictine monastery, says Gibbon, has produced more valuable works than both our universities. Notwithstanding the Codex of Dr Kipling, and the Septuagint of

odious task of comparing the Protestant with the Catholic universities I willingly leave to others ;* but I must say, that I am probably as well acquainted with the latter as he is, and have no hesitation to assert that his statement is uncandid and unjust. I would ask, from whom it was that the first reformers acquired the knowledge of the oriental languages, if not from the catholic monasteries, and catholic universities ? I would ask, who published the Complutensian Polyglott ? a Catholic cardinal. The Antwerpian Polyglott ? a Catholic

" Dr Holmes ; notwithstanding Bampton Lectures, and Seaton Prize Poems ; notwithstanding even the Strabo with which the Clarendon press has been 30 years parturient, the assertion of Gibbon remains true."

Aikin's Annual Rev. 1802, vol. 1. p. 579.

* I will only recommend to the Bishop's attention, a short passage, which I have extracted from a *Charge* composed by an old heathen :

Οσις τοι δοκεῖ τον πλησιον ιδμεναι υδεν,
 Αλλ αυτος μενος ποικιλα δηνε' εχειν,
 Κεινος γ' αφρων εστι, νεκ βεβλαμενος εσθλα·
 Ισως γαρ παντες ποικιλ' επιταμεθα.

Θεογ ;

" Ye Popish blockheads," mitred D——m cries,

" Begone : I, and my friends, alone are wise.

" Rich with the spoils of Babylon, 'tis fit,

" That we should claim monopoly of wit."——

Whoe'er adopts this idle vaunting strain,

Shews but the vapours of an empty brain :

For, spite of party rage, the gifts of heaven,

To every sect, with equal hand are given:

King. The Parisian Polyglott? a Catholic gentleman. All these were published before the English Polyglott; and are we to be told that Catholics are enemies to biblical learning? The first editions of the Samaritan Pentateuch and of the Greek Testament were given by Catholics: the Greek, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopian versions of the Bible, and the Chaldaic paraphrases, were first edited by Catholics: and are we still to be told that Catholics are enemies to biblical learning? The bishop glories in the numerous and improved editions of the Greek Testament given by Protestant writers. I bear a willing testimony to their merit, but express a hope that at the same time the labours of the Catholics who preceded, and who accompanied them in their career, will not be forgotten. The education of a Protestant Clergyman ought indeed to lead him to the study of the Greek text of the New Testament. He may be ignorant of ecclesiastical history and theological learning; the only qualification, or at least a qualification which covers every other defect, is a sufficient knowledge of the Greek Testament.* Yet, with all this ap-

* “ The general neglect in these seminaries (the universities) of
 “ almost every study that has any connection with revealed reli-
 “ gion, in particular of what is distinguished by the appellation
 “ of *divinity*, immediately recurs to our notice. Hence we can-
 “ not be surprised at the too general insufficiency of candidates
 “ for orders; that they are often very ignorant of the scriptures,
 “ and, I may add, even of the duties of piety and morality; that
 “ they are also unacquainted with the peculiar concerns of a pa-
 “ rochial minister; and what is still worse, that they are not dis-

plication to that language, I have not yet observed that a single error has been corrected in the English translation adopted by the Protestant church, or that a Greek text has been yet produced superior in accuracy to the Latin vulgate.*

“ The doctrines and usages of the Romish Church,” infers the Bishop, “ are obstructive to the diffusion of scripture knowledge, and therefore to the progress of the gospel.”† I

posed to feel an interest and pleasure in the discharge of the duties of that station, for which they are destined.—The small share of religious knowledge, that is commonly possessed by those, who offer themselves as candidates for orders, from the universities, being no more than what may be easily acquired in any other situation of life, the church has hence become open to men of every rank and description. It has only been requisite for an unsuccessful tradesman or officer to revise the little Latin and Greek he had acquired in his earlier years at the country school, and apply himself a few weeks to the study of divinity, that is to say, as much as is comprised in Welchman’s Explanation of the Articles, and he was then in possession of every requisite qualification for orders, and as well prepared as many that went from the universities.”—Ingram on the necessity of divinity in Academical Studies, p. 19, 35. anno 1792,—Indeed, as Mr Burke observes, to enable a Protestant minister to exercise his functions, “ little else is necessary than to be able to read the English language.” Letter to a Peer of Ireland.

* “ Some Roman Catholic and even Protestant writers of eminence,” observes the learned author of the *Horæ Biblicæ*, “ have contended, that considering the present state of the Greek text, the vulgate expresses more of the true reading of the originals or autographs of the sacred penman, than any Greek edition that has yet appeared, or can now be framed.”—*Horæ Biblicæ*, p. 196, Oxford edition.

† Charge, p. 18.

blush, when I reflect, that this assertion is made by a man, who cannot be ignorant that every pagan nation, which has yet been converted to the christian faith, has been converted by Catholic missionaries.

In controversy, as well as natural philosophy, it is often more adviseable to attend to facts than to speculation. If the doctrines of the Romish Church be, as the Bishop affirms, obstructive to the diffusion of Christian knowledge, it ought to follow, that her disciples must be more destitute of religious principles than the members of those churches, that, by quitting her communion, have emancipated themselves from these obstructions. But is he prepared to hazard such an assertion? I appeal with confidence to any person of ordinary information, whether the Catholics of this kingdom are not, on the subject of religion, as well instructed as their Protestant brethren. I appeal to those, who have travelled on the continent, and witnessed the attention, with which the Catholic clergy are accustomed to attend to the improvement of the children in their respective parishes, whether the lower classes in Catholic countries, do not possess a greater fund of religious knowledge, than the lower classes in England. “ I have myself,” says a modern writer, “ had some opportunities of ascertaining the comparative knowledge, which the vulgar French and the lower classes of my own countrymen possess of their respective religions. I say it, without partiali-

“ ty, after making the comparison, I do seriously
 “ believe, that, speaking in general, the religious
 “ knowledge of the poorer French, was erudition,
 “ compared with the slender notions of the poorer
 “ English. If this assertion should, to any one,
 “ appear the dictate of prejudice, I will present a
 “ single cause, which alone, may seem to account
 “ for the striking difference:—it is the method,
 “ by which the minds of the French were trained
 “ to the science, and practice of religion.—No
 “ sooner had a child, in France, been taught to
 “ lisp the language of reason, than its parents,
 “ (who it is already supposed had taught it the
 “ usual prayers for children) were compelled to
 “ usher it into the parish church, to learn and re-
 “ peat its catechism. These repetitions were ex-
 “ acted every Sunday of the year; with the ex-
 “ ception, sometimes, of the season for the har-
 “ vest. During some parts of the year, in Ad-
 “ vent and Lent, they were exacted more fre-
 “ quently. A catechism, in France, was not, like
 “ our common Protestant catechism in this coun-
 “ try, the immense length of half a dozen ques-
 “ tions, with the same formidable number of
 “ answers: it was a *book* adequate from its size,
 “ to contain, and by its clearness, convey, a very
 “ comprehensive and accurate knowledge of re-
 “ ligion. This was learnt, verbatim, by heart.
 “ The *Curé*, or his *Vicaire*, explained: and as
 “ the French possess an ease and happiness of
 “ expression, which we, in general, do not, they

“ explained it clearly, naturally, and pleasingly.
 “ The series of these instructions was continued
 “ during the space of several years; always, till
 “ the period when the child was deemed suffi-
 “ ciently informed, to be admitted to the participa-
 “ tion of the holy Eucharist. The degree of
 “ knowledge, which was required for this pur-
 “ pose, was not inconsiderable. It was required,
 “ that the person to be admitted, should not only
 “ understand the importance and obligation of
 “ this sacred action, and the nature of the sacred
 “ rite, but should, also, be able to conceive, and
 “ give a tolerable account of all the great myste-
 “ ries and precepts of religion.—I might have
 “ added to this method, by which the children, in
 “ France, attained the knowledge of religion, the
 “ attention of parents, the assiduity of their
 “ schools, the frequency of other private and
 “ public instructions. I might add also, that the
 “ knowledge, which was thus acquired in youth,
 “ was afterwards maintained and increased by the
 “ weekly admonitions of their pastors; by ser-
 “ mons and discourses; by the use of the sacra-
 “ ments, and by the circulation, and gratuitous
 “ distribution of pious books. There were cir-
 “ cumstances in the religious education of the
 “ French, which rendered it difficult for them to
 “ be ignorant, with ease. Even the poorest, that
 “ were ignorant, were ignorant amid the fairest

“ opportunities, and in spite of the strongest inducements to knowledge.”*

Before the Bishop of Durham repeat this reproach against the Church of Rome, I would advise him to enquire how far the knowledge of religion has flourished here, under the fostering care of the established clergy. The attention of the nation has been lately turned to the subject, by Mr Whitbread’s plan for the instruction of the poor : and the result has been a general conviction, that the ignorance, superstition, and immorality of the lower orders, are an evil of the most alarming magnitude. If the Bishop of Durham alone be ignorant of this truth, let him ask his venerable brother the Bishop of London, who will inform him that in several parts of his diocese, there are “ many hundreds of ignorant, wretched young creatures, of both sexes, totally destitute of all education, totally unacquainted with the very first elements of religion, and who perhaps never once entered within the walls of a church.”† Let him ask that intelligent magistrate, Mr Colquhoun, and he will inform him, that in the population of England alone, “ 1,170,000 children, it is much to be feared, grow up to an adult state, without any education at all, and also without any useful impressions of religion or morality. To these are to be added, many of those who

* See the Spirit of Religious Controversy, p. 159.

† Bishop of London’s Charge, 1790, p. 14.

“ have had the advantage of some education, but
 “ in ill regulated schools, in which proper atten-
 “ tion is not given to religious and moral instruc-
 “ tion. So that in the present state of things it
 “ is not too much to say, that every thirty years
 “ (the period assigned for a new generation) at
 “ least four millions and a half of adults must, in
 “ case a remedy is not applied, mingle in the ge-
 “ neral population of the kingdom, without any
 “ fixed principles of rectitude, and with very little
 “ knowledge either of religion or morality.”*

Such are the blessed effects of the meritorious labour of the Church of England, in editing and illustrating the Greek text of the New Testament. Had the English clergy, like those of the Church of Rome, whose zeal the Bishop thinks highly worthy of imitation, made the diffusion of religious knowledge the great object of their labours and solicitude, we should not now have to view, with fear and astonishment, the ignorance and immorality with which we are surrounded.

From the establishment of Catholic seminaries in this kingdom, the zealous Prelate next draws an argument to enforce on his clergy the necessity of preaching against popish doctrines.† I hope he does not envy us this small indulgence. While a code of sanguinary and vindictive laws rendered us aliens in our own country, we were compelled to

* Colquhoun's New and Appropriate System of Education, p. 72, 73. I have adapted his calculations to England alone.

† Charge, p. 19.

seek an education in more hospitable climes. The toleration which has been granted us by a gracious Sovereign and an enlightened ministry, has encouraged us to open schools in England. The country will not lose by it. A domestic education will strengthen our attachment to our native land, and will retain at home the sums which formerly were of necessity expended abroad. The present ruler of France has made us the most tempting offers to resume our former plan of education in that country. His offers have been refused by our Prelates. The Bishop of Durham will, I trust, applaud their patriotism, and wish success to their endeavours.

In the conclusion of his Charge, the eloquent Prelate pathetically informs his hearers, that he then addressed them, in all probability, for the last time, I, however, am more sanguine. I hope that Providence will add another lustrum to his years, and that he will live to make another visitation of his diocese. It would be presumptuous in me to offer him advice on the conduct which he might pursue on such an occasion: yet even an opponent may sometimes suggest a hint not unworthy of attention.

Fas est et ab hoste doceri.

Perhaps he might be induced to speak in the following manner:

Reverend Brethren. It is now four years since I had the pleasure to address you in this place;

but I trust that the lessons which I then delivered are still impressed on your minds. I have now only to exhort you to comply with them faithfully and diligently. Leave to *Romish Priests* and *Dissenting Ministers* the merit of enforcing the duties of brotherly love, of Christian peace, of mutual forbearance, and the other virtues commanded by the gospel. To you I recommend a more noble theme. You shall be the champions of the Trinity. Be it yours to vindicate from the hostile attempts of the Church of Rome, the honour of God the Father, the mediatorship of the Son, and the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. Oppose your eloquence to the doctrines of Popery. Teach your people the *spirituality* of the Christian worship, which dispenses from the observance of external ceremonies : the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice, which has rendered works of penance unnecessary : the *sole infallibility* of God, who, nevertheless, has appointed each *fallible individual* the surest judge of his doctrine ; and the great duty of searching the Scriptures, which is founded on a *twofold necessity* : a spiritual necessity ; for those who do not believe the doctrine of the gospel shall lose their souls : a temporal necessity ; for those who do not find in the gospel the doctrines of the established church, shall lose the privileges to which they are entitled by their birth.

Brethren. We are the children of the reformation. The pulpit, from which I speak, proclaims the triumph of that sacred cause over the

corruptions of Popery. It is raised over the ashes of Popish bishops and Popish saints ; of Beck, Hatfield, and Skirlaw ; of Beda, Oswald, and Cuthbert. They lived and died in the most damnable errors. Their ignorance of biblical learning caused them to neglect the merit of editing the Greek Testament, and to spend their time in the more ignoble labour of instructing the people : their attachment to outward ceremony, and to the splendor of the public worship, induced them to erect this church of enormous and unnecessary capacity : and the undue stress which they laid on the merit of good works, was the cause that they bequeathed to their successors such princely and superfluous revenues. It is our happiness to live in more enlightened times, to practise a more spiritual religion, to expend the wealth of the church in a manner more beneficial to society. Let us then live up to our high destiny, and constantly bear in mind the honour of God the Father, the mediatorship of the Son, and the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. These shall be our *watch-word* against the surprises of Popery, our band of union, our weapon of attack, and our shield of defence.

THE END.

The first of these is the fact that the
 of the world is not a uniform one, but
 is divided into many different parts, each
 of which has its own peculiar character
 and its own peculiar history. The second
 is the fact that the world is not a static
 one, but is constantly changing and
 developing. The third is the fact that
 the world is not a single entity, but is
 composed of many different parts, each
 of which has its own peculiar character
 and its own peculiar history. The fourth
 is the fact that the world is not a static
 one, but is constantly changing and
 developing. The fifth is the fact that
 the world is not a single entity, but is
 composed of many different parts, each
 of which has its own peculiar character
 and its own peculiar history.

16/04/2012

REVIEW

OF A

PAMPHLET

ENTITLED

“ A PROTESTANT’S REPLY.”

“ For truth hath such a face, and such a mien,

“ As to be loved, needs only to be seen.”

DRYDEN.

W E I T S E I

W E I T S E I

W E I T S E I

W E I T S E I

ADVERTISEMENT TO THE READER.

THE author of the *Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham* had prefixed to his pamphlet a motto from *La Harpe*. The gentleman who undertook to reply, whether a Jewish rabbi, as his name would indicate, or a clergyman, as I should guess from his zeal, after endeavouring to shew his knowledge of the French language by giving a false translation of the motto, informs us in an advertisement, that he does not know who *Mr La Harpe* is. This probably may be true; though I should wish to learn in what part of the literary world our learned controvertist has been slumbering during these last twenty years. To relieve his anxiety, then, *La Harpe* was a French academician, celebrated for his lectures at the *Lycæum*, and distinguished by the title of the *French Quintillian*. An abstract of his life may be read in the *Oxford Review* for February. Thus far to satisfy the enquiries of the gentleman styling himself *Elijah Index*, and dwelling in *Protestant Row, South Shields*. To the reader I have only one word to premise. Should many passages in the

following sheets be deemed too light for so grave a subject, or too severe for so feeble an adversary, I trust a sufficient apology may be found in the multifarious merits of the pamphlet, which I have attempted to review, under its different pretensions, as a vehicle of humour, of controversy, and of abuse.

A REVIEW, &c.

IN the course of the last summer, the Bishop of Durham made the usual visitation of his diocese. The charge which he then delivered was received, as all such charges should be, with attention and respect. With much feeling he informed his clergy, that it was his last dying speech : and their affection induced them to request that, by the aid of the press, he would leave it behind him to edify and console his afflicted flock. However, for reasons which it is not my province to explain, their request appeared to be forgotten ; and the charge, to the great disappointment of the public, was confined, during several months, to the obscurity of the bishop's desk. At length, when expectation was almost exhausted, it was ushered into the light under the most favourable auspices, and at the very moment when the intrigue which succeeded in removing the late ministry from the cabinet, had arrived at maturity. The first who was permitted to feast on the spiritual manna, was his Majesty : and the Charge, as soon as it had been presented to him, was published, and circulated

through these two counties, with an industry equal to the solicitude with which it had been previously withheld. To those who combined the time of its appearance with the nature of its object, it seemed designed to prepare the way for the warwhoop of no popery, which many reverend gentlemen have of late so creditably but unsuccessfully attempted to excite.* I am far, however, from attributing such worldly motives to the right reverend Prelate. At his years, (“they have exceeded the ordinary age of man,”) he is too old to defile himself with the dirt of political intrigue, or “to wish the revival of persecution and impassioned controversy.”† His object, I have no doubt, was to defend what he conceived to be the truth, and to guard his flock against seduction to what he conceived to be error.

In the prosecution, however, of this object, the venerable Prelate thought proper to direct a very impassioned attack against the doctrines of the Catholic Church. He described its members as the parents of infidelity, as idolaters, as mutilators of the sacrament, falsifiers of the Scriptures, enemies to the passion of Christ, patrons of religious ignorance, and adversaries to the diffusion of scriptural knowledge. It was not, I think, in the nature of things, that the Bishop should expect such a

* He foresaw, probably, the temper of the times, and what events were likely to ensue. Protestant's Reply, p. 4.

† Sermon of the Bishop of Durham before the House of Lords, 1799, p. 15.

charge to remain unanswered. Be that as it may, a Catholic writer ventured to meet his Lordship in the field of controversy ; and the issue of the conflict was, at least in the opinion of many Protestants, that the Bishop was fairly unhorsed by his adversary : when lo ! a second champion started up—Mr Elijah Index, and with officious celerity interposed his mantle between the fallen Prelate and the strokes of his opponent. Now, whether this doughty warrior, this new Elijah, be descended from the prophet of old, I am not genealogist enough to determine : but of this I am certain, that from the accuracy of his statements, and the cogency of his reasoning, he must be twin-brother to a liege subject, whose loyalty prompted him not long ago, to disprove the loyalty of others, by imposing on the public the work of a Protestant controvertist for a Catholic catechism !

“ *Ovo prognatus eodem :*”

(or, that I may not speak in an unknown tongue)

“ A chicken hatched from the same egg.”

That the author of the Remarks on the Charge of the Bishop of Durham will condescend to notice so puny an adversary as our Elijah is, I think, hardly to be expected. Yet, as many are accustomed to mistake assertion for fact, and invective for argument, it may not, perhaps, be im-

proper to point out the weakness of the reasoning which he has adopted in his pamphlet. He has volunteered as second to the Bishop of Durham in this controversial duel: why may not I step forward as second to the author of the Remarks? Certainly it cannot be presumption in me to think my services of equal value at least with those of Elijah Index.

Elijah begins by informing us, that he considers his own church “as the best constructed and the most beautiful fabric upon earth.” For this I am willing to give him credit. Every sectarist naturally loves and admires his own creed, because it is the child of his own judgment. I also esteem the Church of England, not indeed as the best constructed and most beautiful fabric upon earth, but as receding the least of all the reformed churches from the beauty and construction of the Church of Rome. It is, to use the words of Dryden—

“The less *deformed*, because *reformed* the least.”

The reformation has, indeed, proved a prolific parent. She has produced Lutherans, Calvinists, Arminians, Anabaptists, Quakers, Methodists, Swedenborgians, Jumpers, and a thousand other sects, which it would be a difficult task to enumerate.* But were I a Protestant, I think I

* Elijah is fond of poetry. Let him, then, take the poet's account of the first reformers and their offspring:—

should most admire the creed of Socinus. The Socinians are of all Protestants the most consistent. They adopt without hesitation the principles which gave birth to the reformation; nor refuse to admit the consequences that naturally flow from them. Their arguments against the faith of the established church, are but transcripts of those which the fathers of the reformation urged against the Church of Rome. The Catholic cannot without a smile behold the orthodox divine sweating and writhing under the difficulty of proving and disproving the validity of the same argument; of proving it, when it is urged by himself against the papist, and of disproving it, when it is urged against him by the Socinian. But what part of the Protestant church may be the most truly Protestant, is foreign to the present enquiry. Leaving Elijah, therefore, to gaze at the

- " Church quacks, with passions under no command,
- " Who fill the world with doctrines contraband,
- " Discoverers of they know not what, confined
- " Within no bounds—the blind that lead the blind ;
- " To streams of popular opinion drawn,
- " Deposit in those shallows all their spawn ;
- " The wriggling fry soon fill the creeks around,
- " Poisoning the waters where their swarms abound.
- " Scorn'd by the nobler tenants of the flood,
- " Minnows and gudgeons gorge the unwholesome food.
- " The propagated myriads spread so fast,
- " Even Lewenhoeck himself would stand aghast,
- " Employed to calculate the enormous sum,
- " And own his crab-computing powers o'ercome."

beauty of his own church, we will return to his pamphlet.

His great object in the preliminary observations is to shew, that the first provocation was given, not by the Bishop of Durham, but by the author of the Remarks. To most of my readers this assertion will appear extraordinary; and they will naturally conceive that our Israelite entertains far different notions of provocation from the generality of mankind. The Bishop had painted the tenets of the Catholic church in the most odious colours; he had held up its members to the detestation and contempt of every sincere christian; “and yet,” says Elijah, “here was no challenge offered, no provocation given, no attack made.”* This is really very pleasant. In the opinion of our new doctor, if you insult your neighbour, and he repel the insult, it is not you, but he who is the aggressor. Such a doctrine might suit the creed of tyrants and persecutors—it will be reprobated by Englishmen and Christians. Law, reason, and religion, give to the accused the privilege of defence. Had the Bishop of Durham been content to assert that the doctrines professed by Catholics are false, no man could have complained of an attempt on our part to prove them true; but to condemn us to silence, when opinions are imputed to us which we abhor—when we are represented as enemies to all that Christians vene-

* Reply. p. 6.

rate as sacred, is an insult to humanity and common sense.

“ But,” resumes Elijah, “ the Bishop did no more than his duty ; he preached the doctrines of his church.” Be it so. I do believe that the doctrines of the established church are in general mere negative things. They are only denials of opinions imputed, whether justly or unjustly, to the Church of Rome. If its admirers can only persuade themselves that the Pope is antichrist, and Rome the whore of Babylon, they appear in their own eyes profound theologians. I know also that many clergymen, when they have declaimed against what they are pleased to term Popery, think they have satisfied all their obligations. To explain and enforce the mild and amiable virtues of the gospel, is, in their opinion, a work of far less merit than to display their enmity to the Catholic doctrines, and to instil their own prejudices into the minds of the audience. But even supposing that the Bishop, in preaching against our principles, did *his* duty, I hope Elijah will allow, that the remarker did also *his* duty in defending them.

“ Hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim.”

Whatever may be the opinion of the second on this point, I am convinced that his principal is too liberal to require that we should sit down contented under the lash of misrepresentation, and by our

silence subscribe to the inferences that our enemies may draw against us.

The Bishop, in his Charge, had accused the Catholics of idolatry, and had rested this accusation on the assertion, that the abuse is inseparable from the use of religious images, and that idolatry is the inevitable consequence. The remarker, in his reply, had maintained that the imputation of idolatry was groundless; that the worship of images was forbidden by the Catholic Church, and that the Bishop might convince himself of the soundness of our doctrine on this subject, if he would only consult our catechism, or interrogate the first Catholic child of ten years of age, that he might chance to meet in the street.* In this state

* The Bishop of Durham had employed in this part of his Charge a very illiberal kind of argument against the intellectual powers of the Catholics; and the remarker had, in the character of a deist, retorted a similar objection against the Bishop. To escape from the pressure of this mode of reasoning, Elijah has recourse to a most miserable quibble. That he may not, however, wander from the real subject, I will not attempt to shew the inutility of the artifice; but supposing the Bishop to be a disciple of the Athanasian creed, will beg leave to substitute in the Remarks the word *person* instead of the word *man*. The passage will run thus: "Should a deist observe, that the same superstition (he
" thinks it so) which could induce the Bishop of Durham to be-
" lieve, that a person clothed in the same flesh, and subject to the
" same infirmities as ourselves, was the very God who framed the
" heavens and the earth, might with equal facility persuade him
" to worship the creature image for the Creator, I could wish to
" learn what would be his reply." Whatever that reply may be,

of the controversy, Elijah comes forward with an air of importance, and informs us—of what? That the catechism does teach the worship of images? That he has interrogated some Catholic child, and discovered him to be an idolater? No; but that sometimes in Catholic countries images are carried in public processions. Reader, take his words—
 “The sole end of producing these images in their
 “gaudy trappings is, not to move God, but—
 “must I speak out?” Yes, good Elijah, pray do speak—
 “to move the populace—to persuade the
 “multitude—of what? either that there is a
 “power in the image itself, which can draw down
 “blessings upon them; or, that their mediator,
 “represented by his or her image, can prevail
 “upon God in their behalf.”* How contracted must be the ingenuity of our Jewish theologian, if he can discover no other motive than these two! How blunt his logical acumen, if he conceive that there is no medium between them! Let Elijah mount his blazing chariot, and witness one of these processions; and he will probably discover that it is composed of the incorporated companies of the town, and of the clergy attached to the different churches. Before the former, he will see borne the emblems of their respective trades; before the latter, the pictures or the images of the

if it be of any weight, it will prove a sufficient answer to the Bishop's argument against the Catholics.

* Reply, p. 10.

saints in whose names their churches are dedicated; and he will learn that as much divine worship is given to the one as to the other. If after this he be still convinced that to carry images in procession is idolatry, let him condemn Joshua of idolatry, for having caused the ark to be carried in procession across the Jordan, and David for having danced before it in procession at its entrance into Zion; let him proclaim the Mayor of Newcastle an idolater, whenever the mace is borne before him; the free-masons idolaters, when they carry their mystic emblems in public; the king, lords, and commons, of Great Britain, idolaters, when they decree, in honour of the illustrious dead, the pomp of a national funeral. In reality, the carrying of images in procession has no more to do with the Catholic creed, than the carrying of them at the interment of Lord Nelson had to do with the thirty-nine articles.*

But the Bishop, not satisfied with accusing the Catholics of idolatry, has added another crime of

* Conscious of the emptiness of his own reasoning on the subject, Elijah has appended to it, as a make-weight, a passage from Stillingfleet. That Stillingfleet was an adept in the art of spinning the web of sophistry, is well known; but in the present instance, his usual discernment seems to have forsaken him; for his arguments, if they prove any thing, prove this, that God himself soon violated his own commandment, and introduced idolatry among his chosen people, when he ordered Moses to make two cherubim of gold, of beaten work, in the two ends of the mercy seat, the one on the one end, and the other on the other end.—Exod. xxv. 19.

still blacker dye. He has charged us with having suppressed the second commandment in our books of religious institution, in order to conceal the impiety of the practice from the eyes of the vulgar. Fortunately the absurdity of the charge carries with it its own refutation. Does the Bishop of Durham think—does even his champion, Elijah, think, that Catholics are so infatuated as to believe, that they can escape the guilt of idolatry by the suppression of the commandment which forbids it? But what proof does the Bishop bring to substantiate his assertion? Nothing more than his own word, his *υτος εφη*. In reply, the Remarker denies the odious calumny, and appeals to the justice of any of his readers who will take the trouble to consult a Catholic catechism, Catholic prayer book, or Catholic bible. Here Elijah rushes in between the two combatants, and bids them both to be silent. Perhaps he has discovered that the commandment is *suppressed* in the Catholic catechism, or the prayer book, or the bible. No, he acknowledges that it is retained; and yet, with this avowal still warm on his tongue, he has the effrontery to assert that it is in reality suppressed. What then, the reader will say, are to retain and to suppress the same thing? In Elijah's logic they are. “You blend,” he exclaims, “the first and second commandment together; you mix two distinct subjects together; you make the second an adjunct to the first, and

“ thus you sophisticate it out of the decalogue.”* Good Elijah, instead of attempting to demonstrate what you know to be impossible, look at your own Hebrew bible, and you will find that the Catholics place this commandment exactly where Moses placed it, and express it in the very same words in which Moses expressed it. If, then, the guilt of the suppression be imputed to the Catholics, the Jewish legislator must share it with them. As to the Bishop, I can excuse him from the crime of calumny. He had probably read the tale in some old controvertist, and was credulous enough to believe it. His mistake was therefore unintentional. But for Elijah I know not what apology to frame. He knew the calumny had no foundation in truth, and yet he assisted with all his might to prop it up.

But hold, cries Elijah—“ talking and reasoning are not the same thing. Go to an old friend of mine, Dr Hey, and he will tell you that in a church about 35 miles S. E. of Paris, are the ten commandments in old French, round the chancel: the second is entirely left out. The ninth is—Give not up yourself to the flesh, and *marry but once*. The tenth—Desire not the goods of others, and *lie not at all*.” This is undoubtedly a most curious discovery, and I congratulate the public, and in particular the biblical student, on the important information which

* Reply, p. 14.

they may derive from Dr Hey's travels. With that gentleman I have not the honour to be personally acquainted; but I have no doubt that Elijah has dropped his mantle upon him, and imparted to him a portion of his spirit.*

Before I proceed to the next charge adduced by the Bishop, I must notice a few other subjects which Elijah has woven into the former discussion. He wishes to know whether St Paul reasoned inconclusively, when he called the elements bread and wine, after the consecration. I answer, no. St Paul believed and spoke as Catholics still believe and speak. Though we believe Christ to be truly present in the eucharist, yet we have no difficulty of calling it bread and wine, even after the consecration. Did Elijah never meet in scripture with texts which attribute motion to the sun, and stability to the earth? He ought to know that in discoursing on subjects of this description, men generally speak of things as they appear to the senses, and not as they are in reality.

The Remarker had asked, how the Bishop of

* The story about the commandments in the church S. E. of Paris, reminds me of the two travellers (Elijah Index and Elisha Hey perhaps) described by the poet :

- " Surprised at all they meet, the gosling pair,
- " With awkward gait, stretched neck, and silly stare,
- " Discover huge cathedrals built with stone,
- " And steeples towering high, much like our own;
- " But shew peculiar light by many a grin
- " At popish practices observed within."

Durham could reconcile his disbelief of the real presence with his belief that *the body and blood of Christ are received verily and indeed in the Lord's Supper*. How can they be received, if they are not there? Elijah answers—that the catechism of the Church of England is wrong, when it asserts *the body and blood of Christ to be received verily and indeed*, (but in this case can the Bishop, with a safe conscience, suffer it to be taught in his diocese?) and refers us to her 28th article, in which she says, “that the body of Christ is received and
 “eaten in the supper, only after an heavenly and
 “spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the
 “body of Christ is received and eaten, is faith.” But truly the meaning of this doctrine is not so clear as to be obvious to every understanding. The manner in which the eucharist is received, is evidently by eating and drinking; but whether eating and drinking be an heavenly and spiritual, or an earthly and bodily operation, is a matter of little consequence. What I could wish to learn is, whether the body of Christ received in the eucharist be his real body or not. If it be, it must be there, and a real presence must be admitted. If it be not his real body, pray do inform me what kind of thing that is, which is the body of Christ, and not his body, and which may be received at the Lord's Supper, without being there?

To the second charge of the Bishop, respecting the invocation of the saints, the author of the Remarks had replied by a clear and perspicuous

statement of the catholic doctrine on that subject. Elijah is not satisfied with it, and he objects that God is a jealous God; *i. e.* he will not suffer his honour to be given to the creature. This is undoubtedly true, and I congratulate our Israelite on having for once at least stumbled on the truth. But is it evident, that to invoke the intercession of the saints is to give them the honour due to God? Is it the same thing to beg a fellow-creature to pray for us, and to beg of God to grant us his blessings? The very act of desiring the prayers of the saints proclaims that we do not think them Gods, but look upon them as only the *servants* of God.* In treating this subject, the Bishop had quoted several texts of scripture, and improved the greater part of them by the addition of the important word *alone*. Elijah is convinced that this addition was introduced by his

* On this subject our Christian rabbi calls in a second time the friendly assistance of Doctor Stillingfleet. From him we learn that it is not so much the invocation of the saints that gives offence, as the invoking them "on our knees with all the solemnity used to God himself." This kneeling, it seems, constitutes the deadly sin. Yet I am surprised that any Protestant should have objections to it. Does not the orthodox churchman, when he communicates, kneel before the bread and wine, "mere bodily elements of earthly manufacture," as the Bishop of Durham calls them, Charge, p. 11? Is kneeling, then, necessarily an act of divine worship? Elijah must own that it is not. But to return to the catholic: by his creed he is allowed to beg the prayers of the saints as often as he pleases, and in whatever posture he pleases, by sitting, standing, or kneeling, provided he mean not by that posture to pay them any divine honour.

lordship, not as *cited*, but as *inferred* from Scripture. It may be so. The bishop, perhaps, in the delivery of his discourse, was careful, by a particular inflexion of voice, to distinguish the passages which were *inferred*, from those which were *cited* from Scripture. But how was the reader to learn the difference? In the printed charge there is no mark to point out the inference; and I have little hesitation in saying, that many of those who perused it, were led to believe that the word *alone* formed a part of the texts which were quoted.

The doctrine of the catholic church, respecting the nature of penance, which the Bishop had described as a denial of the efficacy of Christ's passion, and that respecting the merit of good works, which he had declared dishonourable to the sacred influence of the Holy Ghost, the remarker explained, not as they are misrepresented by Protestants, but as they are taught by Catholics. He expressed a conviction that this explication was so consonant to reason, that no one who considered it attentively, would dare to gainsay it. In this he does not appear to have been disappointed. On the subject of good works, Elijah, by his silence, testifies his assent: on that of penance he seems to differ from the Remarker, but that difference is rather apparent than real. Elijah says, that we are commanded to perform works of penance, "but forbidden to set a value on
" these ordinances as good in themselves, since

“ they are means only of promoting vital god-
 “ liness in us.” The Remarker says, that they are
 not to be considered “ as a sufficient compensation
 “ for sin, but one of the conditions on which
 “ Christ is willing to communicate the merits of
 “ his passion to the soul of the sinner.” The
 words are different; the sense is nearly the same.*

Elijah, before he closes the subject of penance,
 requests that he “ may be allowed to indulge a
 “ vein of what is very natural to him, and what
 “ Mr La Harpe would call naïveté or originality,
 “ but which he thinks is more like ridicule, and
 “ flows too freely from him.” This is really *naïf*,
 though Elijah did not know it. I am happy in
 having it in my power to agree with him for once.

* Our Israelite is not pleased that the author of the Remarks
 should prefer *υπωπειάζω* to *υποπειάζω* in quoting St Paul. I
 have no objection to either. The Remarker, I imagine, tran-
 scribed the word from the Greek Testament edited by Mr Reeves,
 the king's printer of the bible, and dedicated by him to his ma-
 jesty. Now, knowing the king to be the head of the established
 church, he could not suspect that he should be reprimanded by
 an orthodox clergyman for making use of such an edition. Eli-
 jah, however, is at liberty to prefer, if he chuse, the authority of
 Courcelles to that of Mr Reeves; the Remarker's argument is
 equally powerful with either reading. He also reminds us in a
 note, of the “ *flagellants*, or flogging orders of monks and nuns
 “ in the Romish church.” Perhaps he was ignorant that
flagellants, or flogging orders, were not members of the Romish
 church, but sects of fanatics, who appeared in the fourteenth,
 fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, and were always anathematized
 by the Pope. On this subject he may consult Mosheim, in his
 account of the centuries before mentioned.

I think, like him, that the *ridicule* flows too freely from him, and that the whole of the passage is sovereignly *ridiculous*.

The Bishop of Durham had charged the Church of Rome with violating the command of Christ, by denying the use of the cup to the laity in the Lord's supper. Of the very cogent arguments, by which the writer of the Remarks had proved that no command was violated, because none had been given, Elijah takes no notice; probably for this very substantial reason, that he found himself unable to refute them. He has, however, had recourse to a stratagem, which demonstrates that he is no enemy to pious frauds, if they prove serviceable to his cause. He attributes to the Remarker an inference which is not to be found in his pamphlet, and then shews it to be inconclusive, that he may impress the reader with an idea that the reasoning of his adversary is weak and contemptible. From the change which has taken place in the manner of administering the sacrament of baptism, the Remarker did not directly "infer that the cup may be denied to the laity;" but from that, and several other instances, he justly deduced this consequence—that in the administration of the sacraments, and other points of religious discipline, the pastors of the church must be acknowledged the legitimate interpreters of the intention of their divine legislator. He shewed, that unless the Bishop of Durham admitted this principle, he could not justify the cus-

tom of baptism by aspersion or affusion, nor the oaths which are taken in his courts, nor the eating of blood, nor the omission of the practice of washing the feet of others. So much for the fairness with which Elijah answers the arguments of his adversary.*

It is probable, that when our zealous Israelite first imposed on himself the task of refuting the *Remarks*, he over-rated his own abilities, or undervalued those of his opponent. With vigour he rushed to the attack, but his courage soon forsook him ; and now, before he has skirmished with one half of the enemy's posts, he is preparing for a

* In a note, he appeals to Bingham, and with the appearance of much learning triumphs in the discovery of a passage from a letter of Pope Celasius, by which he thinks communion under one kind is forbidden. He would have shewn more ecclesiastical knowledge, if he had first discussed the authenticity of the decree, since it is doubted by the best critics. But if he thought the authority of Gratian sufficient to establish it, he should also have admitted the remainder of Gratian's text, viz. that it related (not to the communion of the laity, but) to some priests, who, after consecrating both the bread and the wine, refused through superstition to receive the latter. (De Consec. dis. ii. c. 12.) This is still reprobated by the Church of Rome. Pope Leo is also referred to : but he only condemns the Manicheans, who refused the cup through the idea that wine was unclean. Indeed I cannot see the reason of all this pother. If the Catholic opinion respecting the real presence be true, the same effect follows from the communion under one kind as under both : if the Protestant opinion be true, all that is refused by the refusal of the cup, is a drop of mere wine. Certainly the death of the Lord may be commemorated as easily by eating only, as by eating and drinking.

precipitate retreat. Still, like the Parthian, but with less dexterity, during his retreat he shoots a few random arrows, which are incapable of mischief to his adversary, but may with advantage be retorted on himself. The Bishop had accused the Church of Rome of resting on ritual ordinances, hostile to the influences of the Holy Spirit; and the Remarker had repelled the charge, by advancing what he called a fact, that the moral conduct of Catholics was not inferior to that of their Protestant brethren, and by drawing this inference, that their ritual observances were not more hostile to the influences of the Holy Spirit, than the naked, lifeless worship of their adversary. The silence of Elijah will justify me in the supposition that he assents to this position: but he is angry that curiosity should be numbered by the Remarker among the motives which may induce christians to frequent places of public worship. I acknowledge that it is not the most perfect of all motives: but we must take mankind as they are, not as we could wish them to be; and, like skilful workmen, we must mould the materials which we possess into the best possible form. A man, whom curiosity among other motives excites, may, from his attendance at the public service, learn what he knew not before, and be induced to serve the Almighty with greater fervour than he had before experienced. We have in us an insatiate thirst after novelty; which, in some degree, must be satisfied: and I have no hesitation to ascribe, partially at

least, the solitude of the Protestant churches to the constant monotony—the eternal sameness of the service. As to the sarcastic expressions of *scenic worship* and *nominal christians*, they only expose the ignorance of their author. Let him attend but once at any of the Catholic chapels in his neighbourhood, and then say whether he has not observed in them as much attention, as much real and solid devotion, as he ever witnessed in any other place of religious worship, or even in his own church.

On the subject of indulgences, the Remarker had inserted some curious observations on the sale of indulgences in the established church, and had paid a few well-turned compliments to the zeal which the clergy had displayed in their attempts to eradicate the abuse. To these three pages Elijah makes this forcible and comprehensive reply—“ You then cite Archbishop Grindall’s instructions to his clergy, &c. &c. &c.” Alas !

“ ————— Vox faucibus hæsit.”

The custom of reading the mass in the Latin tongue, is another subject which has been debated between the Bishop and the Remarker. Elijah here, instead of answering the arguments of the latter,* is pleased to misrepresent them, that he

* He has, however, inserted a note, in which he begs that St Paul, whose opinion, he says, is *diametrically* opposite to ours, may be allowed to decide the question. The catholic will cheer-

may impress his reader with an idea that they are absurd. The Remarker did not infer that, because the universities and the colleges of Eton and Winchester had obtained permission to perform divine service in Latin, it ought also to be performed in Latin in every village in the kingdom; but he contended, and that too with some appearance of reason, that those, who had by act of parliament compelled, under the severest penalties, the native Irish to assist at the service in English, a language to them unintelligible, should blush when they reproached the catholics with the custom of celebrating the mass in the language of ancient Rome. Nor was this inference his own: it was that of a pillar of the protestant church—Dr Heylin.

Biblical learning was another topic, which the Bishop had introduced into his charge; and with respect to which he endeavoured to countenance

fully appeal to the decision of St Paul, but will not submit that Elijah should be the sole interpreter of his words. Now, if our rabbi will take the trouble to peruse, without prejudice, the chapter to which he refers, he will, I think, acknowledge that St Paul does not so much as mention the use of an ancient tongue in the liturgy, but directs his animadversions solely against some of the Corinthians, who, through ostentation, affected to preach to their brethren, and to recite their prayers in languages utterly unknown. If Elijah reject this explanation, I hope for the future he will adopt in his church the discipline of the quakers, and “let the prophets speak two or three, and let the others judge. If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace. For ye may all prophecy one by one, that all may learn and all may be comforted.” 1 Cor. xiv, 29, 31.

a belief, that the catholics were wretchedly ignorant. He would persuade us, that whatever has hitherto been done for the elucidation of the sacred text, has been done by protestants. In reply, the Remarker reminded him, that the first reformers derived their knowledge of the ancient languages from the Catholic universities: that the three first polyglotts which have appeared, with the first editions of almost all the oriental versions, were given by catholics; and that the study of theology and its sister sciences, were, and are pursued with far greater application in the Catholic, than the Protestant universities. To all this Elijah replies not one word. He deserts his bishop in his utmost need.

He chuses, however, to show his own biblical knowledge, by a criticism on the Latin vulgate. "In Genesis iii. v. 15. the vulgate has (*ipsa*) "she," i. e. "She shall bruise thy head." "Now this is a gross error: an alteration purposely made to countenance the worship of the "Virgin Mary."*

From this passage I begin to think it probable that our Elijah is the Jewish prophet himself; at least he must have been born about eighteen hundred years ago: for had he not been contemporary with the translator of this passage, it is not likely that he could have known his real motive for preferring the feminine to the masculine pro-

* Reply, p. 23.

noun. The passage is taken, not from St Jerome's version, but from one much more ancient, called the *Vetus Itala*, and believed to have been made in the first century of the christian æra. If, then, the translator purposely corrupted the passage in order to "countenance the worship of the Virgin Mary," it will follow that the worship of the Virgin Mary was established in the christian church as early as the first century. But this is all folly—the fancy of

A shallow brain behind a serious mask,
An oracle within an empty cask.

The worship of the Virgin Mary never was admitted by Catholics, either in the first or the nineteenth century. They respect her, indeed, as the mother of the Messiah, but they do not worship her; and if Elijah will consult the English version of the vulgate, he will find the following note, which proves, that if the wish of the translator was to countenance the worship of the Virgin Mary, he was deficient in not leaving some memorial of it to his successors, as they appear to be ignorant of his intentions. The note is—" *She shall crush,*" *ipsa*, the woman: so divers of the fathers read this place, conformably to the Latin; others read it *ipsum*, the seed. The sense is the same: for it is *by her seed, Jesus Christ*, that the woman crushes the serpent's head.*

* Several of the ancient Latin versions appear to have retained the feminine pronoun. By St Augustine the passage is quoted

The last attempt of Elijah is an insinuation, that if the Catholic Church has been the herald of the gospel to infidel nations, her zeal has always been inspired by the hope of temporal reward. This feeble sarcasm can reflect disgrace only on its author. As long as it remains in his pamphlet, he will have no other means of escaping the imputation of falshood, than by avowing his ignorance of ecclesiastical history. He appeals, indeed, to the authority of a poet. But poets are too frequently employed in the manufacture of fable, to adhere to the sober truth of history.*

thus: "*Ipsa tibi servabit caput, et tu servabis ejus calcaneum.*" St Au gus. De Gen.ad lit. l. xi. c. 36. See also De Gen. adversus Manich. l. 11. c. 18. St Ambrose, de fuga, sæc. c. 7. Beda Expos. in Gen. p. 25. The ancient copies of Josephus also seem to have had the same reading, since Rufinus thus translates the passage in the third chapter of the first book: "*Præcepit, ut mulier capiti ejus plagas inferret.*"

* It is a suspicious circumstance, that when writers attempt to refute what they call the errors of the Church of Rome, they are careful to argue not so much against her real tenets, as those imputed to her by her adversaries. One can hardly think that a good cause should require the aid of so mean and unworthy an artifice. For the satisfaction of the Bishop and of Elijah, I shall state our real doctrine on the principal subjects of this controversy. The Bishop asserts that we derogate from the honour of God the Father by maintaining the worship of images: the doctrine of the Catholic Church is, that it is unlawful to worship pictures or images, but that it is lawful to place them in churches, and improper to treat them with disrespect under the pretence that they are idols. The Bishop asserts, that we derogate from the mediators of Christ, by admitting the saints and angels as mediators, and from the efficacy of his passion, by considering works

" ————— Pictoribus atque poetis

" Quid libet audendi semper fuit aqua potestas."

Yet even Hudibras, had he been fairly transcribed, confines his fiction to the Spanish territories of South America.

Thus have I arrived at the termination of Elijah's pamphlet. I shall conclude, as he has begun, by observing, that every man has a right to embrace that creed which he is convinced to be founded on the unerring authority of the Word of God ; and I will also venture to add, that every man has a right to defend that creed, which he has thus embraced, when it is unjustly and illiberally attacked. This the author of the Remarks

of penance as purchases of pardon. The Catholic doctrine is, that we have but one mediator, Christ Jesus, and that he alone by his death has paid the ransom of our iniquities : but that it is lawful to desire the saints and angels to pray for us through his merits, and that works of penance are one of the conditions on which he is willing to communicate the efficacy of his passion to the soul of the sinner. The Bishop asserts that we derogate from the influence of the Holy Spirit by our presumptuous doctrine respecting the merit of good works, and our reliance on external performances. The Catholic doctrine is, that Christ will grant to good works the reward which he has promised, and that " his church has the authority to decree rites or ceremonies," such as she thinks proper for the celebration of the divine service. Let the Bishop, or his champion Elijah, prove these doctrines to be false, and they will confer an immortal benefit on the Catholic public. Till they do this, they " fight as one beating the air," and all their charges and replies are no more than " sounding " brass and tinkling cymbals."

undertook to do, after the publication of the Charge by the Bishop of Durham. He could have no personal enmity to that Prelate. The Bishop is an exalted character. His age, his station, his private virtues, demand respect. But if, forgetful of all these, he put on the armour of a youthful warrior, and direct an impassioned attack against the religious opinions of his neighbours, he must abide by the consequences. Truth and reason have always proved more than a match for misrepresentation. It had been better if the Bishop had not provoked the contest : it had been better still, if Elijah, by attempting to palliate, had not emblazoned the disgrace of his defeat.

F I N I S.

The first of these is the fact that the
 Government has been unable to
 secure the necessary funds to
 carry out its policy. This is due
 to the fact that the Government
 has been unable to secure the
 necessary funds to carry out its
 policy. This is due to the fact
 that the Government has been
 unable to secure the necessary
 funds to carry out its policy.

A
GENERAL
VINDICATION
OF
THE REMARKS ON THE CHARGE
OF THE
BISHOP OF DURHAM,

CONTAINING
A REPLY
TO A LETTER FROM A CLERGYMAN OF THE
DIOCESE OF DURHAM, (SECOND ED.)

A REPLY
TO THE
OBSERVATIONS OF THE REV. THOS. LE MESURIER,
Rector of Newton Longville.

A REPLY
TO THE STRICTURES OF THE REV. G. S. FABER,
Vicar of Stockton upon Tees.

AND SOME
OBSERVATIONS
ON THE MORE FASHIONABLE METHODS OF
INTERPRETING THE APOCALYPSE.

Let not those (who charge the Papists to be Idolators) lead the
People by the Nose to believe they can prove their Supposition
when they cannot. *Thorndike, Just Weights, p. 11.*

REVISED

NEW EDITION

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

VINDICATION, &c.

THERE are scarcely any subjects of literary investigation, which at certain periods take a stronger hold of the mind, or more readily awaken the passions, than those which are connected with religious controversy. The Remarks, which a Catholic writer lately ventured to offer on the Bishop of Durham's Charge (a Charge containing, in the opinion of unprejudiced judges, a cruel and unprovoked attack on the opinions of Catholics); appear to have alarmed and irritated the zeal of several among the watchmen of the holy city. I say of several, because I know that many members of that respectable body, the established clergy, have condemned the acrimony of the Bishop's pamphlet, and have lamented that it was ever made the subject of public discussion. Scarcely however, had two months elapsed from the first publication of the Remarks, before two reverend apologists had emptied the vials of their vengeance on the head of the writer: Their characters and

pretensions seem to be of very different orders. The first that appeared in the field was a gentleman of Rabbinical descent, by name Elijah Index, whom gaiety instead of learning furnished with arms, and zeal instead of prudence urged to the contest. But his campaign was speedily terminated. Elijah, after a short struggle, found his own *naïveté* and *ridicule* so successfully retorted on himself, that he had the good sense to seek a timely and precipitate retreat. At his departure, a clergyman of the diocese of Durham volunteered as his substitute, but wisely refused to wear his uniform. Instead of *naïveté* and *ridicule*, he seized the rusty weapons of antiquated controvertists, and endeavoured to overpower his adversary with scraps and extracts from their writings. His name, indeed, he has judged it prudent to conceal: yet to aid the conjectures of his readers, he has kindly condescended to favour them with his portrait. “I am,” he says, “of a heavy “disposition, clumsy and awkward, and a dull “matter-of-fact enquirer.”* His claim to these admirable qualifications it would ill become me to dispute. Indeed, his work appears to depose in his favour; and I have traced, with considerable satisfaction, the features of the parent in those of his offspring. One expression only I beg leave to improve, by adding, that if he be a matter-of-fact enquirer, he has seldom the good fortune to be a matter-of-fact discoverer.

* Clergyman's Letter, p. 8.

The matter of fact, to which the clergyman had devoted his attention, was not a subject of very difficult investigation. It required no extraordinary diligence of research, no peculiar powers of discrimination. It was merely to decide, which of the two, the Bishop of Durham, or the author of the Remarks, had delineated with greater accuracy the doctrines of the Catholic church. That their delineations are contradictory, is evident; and the consequence must be, that one of them has knowingly or ignorantly incurred the guilt of misrepresentation. The charges which the Bishop has so pointedly preferred, the Remarker has as emphatically denied: the odious doctrines which the first has with so much liberality bestowed, the other has with equal pertinacity refused. Now the presumption is, as far as I may be allowed to judge, in favour of the Remarker. It is not natural to suppose, that a Catholic clergyman, who has studied in a Catholic university, and has been in the habit of teaching the Catholic doctrine, can be ignorant of his own creed. But it is possible that his Right Reverend opponent may have applied with greater application to the study of the thirty-nine articles, than of the canons of the council of Trent. It is possible that he may have derived his knowledge of the Catholic tenets from a suspicious and impure source, the writings of Protestant controversialists. It is possible that education may have given a bias to his mind, and warped it with prejudice.

It is possible that partiality for his own creed, a creed as bountiful to him as could have been the waters of Pactolus, may have taught him to view with a less friendly eye the creeds of others. However this may be, an adversary cannot at the best be considered as the most unexceptionable witness; and a Protestant prelate, how splendid soever may be his talents, may, without offence, be challenged as an unsafe expositor of the Catholic doctrine. The clergyman is, notwithstanding, of a contrary opinion. He sturdily maintains the infallibility of his bishop, repels with indignation the very suspicion of ignorance or illiberality, and opposes with pious officiousness his cobweb shield to the spear of the Remarker.

I have often considered it as an extraordinary phenomenon in the history of the human mind, that in England the Catholics are not allowed the faculty of understanding their own belief. Of the myriads of declaimers against popery, with whom this island abounds, from the unlettered female who reads theological lectures to her pupils in the nursery, to the Right Reverend divine who instructs his brethren the clergy of his diocese, there is not one who does not appear to claim a more accurate knowledge of the Catholic doctrine than the very Catholics themselves. Their decisions are more infallible than those of the Roman pontiff. It is in vain that we disclaim the odious tenets which they impute to us; in vain that we appeal to our professions of faith, and the canons of

our councils. Our complaints are disregarded, and our protestations treated with contempt: the obstinacy of our adversaries will neither yield to argument or authority: objections, which have been a thousand times refuted, are confidently brought forward as demonstrations of our folly and impiety; and the misrepresentations of prejudice are eagerly received with the veneration due to simple unvarnished truth.

In the present instance, however, the Bishop's apologist has condescended to acknowledge that the author of the Remarks may have been acquainted with the creed of his own church; but this acknowledgement is coupled with an insinuation more insulting and illiberal than could have been the denial itself. Assuming to himself the prerogative of him who searches the reins and heart, he accuses the Remarker of artifice, insincerity, and fraud. "His conscience," he boldly affirms, "bore witness to the accuracy of the Bishop's charge. His object was to disguise the truth from the eyes of the public; and, as he was a disciple of the doctrine which teaches that the end consecrates the means, he had adopted stratagems proscribed by the laws of literary warfare."* Language such as this, the Remarker certainly will not honour with a reply.

* Clergyman's Letter, p. 7, 30, 41, 42.

He would say with the poet :—

A moral, sensible, and well bred man
Will not affront me, and no other can.

If abuse can ever prove an useful auxiliary, it can only be in the absence of argument. It may, indeed, help to conceal the weak side of a bad cause ; but must injure and disgrace a good one. Yet I may be allowed to ask what possible motive the Remarker could have to disguise the doctrines of his church, at the expense of sincerity and truth ? Was it that he was sensible they could not be maintained by argument ? But, in that supposition, why should he rather disguise than renounce them ? I know of no motive that can bind a Catholic clergyman to his faith, but the conviction of its truth. His mind cannot be influenced by gratitude for past favours, or by the hope of future preferment. The Catholic church has not, like the established church, in this kingdom, rich and easy livings to bestow on her champions : she cannot invite them, after the heat of the contest, to repose in the lap of wealth and indolence. Was it that he was ashamed to avow his real belief ? I can see no reason for such shame. His belief is not the belief of a single nation, nor of the growth of a few years. It is the belief of the great majority of Christians. It is, and for centuries has been, the belief of learned and polished nations ; the belief of scholars, philosophers, and divines ; of generals,

statesmen, and princes.* Proudly as I may think of my own country, I cannot yet persuade myself that intellectual excellence is exclusively confined to this island: and when I look on the continent, and view the populous nations which there profess the Catholic faith,—when I look back into past ages, and behold millions of men, during a long series of generations, reckoning it as their pride and their happiness, I can smile at the invectives of its adversaries, and despise the disgrace which is heaped upon it here.

I am well aware of the daring and adventurous spirit of controversy. I know that in the eager pursuit of victory it is not to be appalled by ordinary difficulties; that in the hope of subduing an opponent, it will heedlessly endanger its own security. But there are some objects to which no religious disputant ought to be indifferent; and to vindicate the truth of Christianity must certainly be as important a duty as to crush the corruptions of popery. Now it has always appeared to me no easy matter to reconcile the opinions of these reverend and right reverend theologians with the avowed object of Christ's mission, or the real nature of the gospel dispensation. For what end did

* "Catholicity, which has been this night the subject of so much abuse, has been the belief of the most extensive and enlightened nations in Europe, and of the most illustrious characters that ever did honour to the name of man."—Speech of Lord Hutchinson in the House of Lords, May 10, 1805. Cuthell, p. 110.

“ the mighty God, the equal of the Father, the
 “ Lord of all things, both in heaven and earth,”
 assume the lowly nature of man, suffer the disgraceful death of the cross, and atone for the sins of mankind ? Was it merely to scatter the seeds of a pure and celestial religion among the nations, to watch over its increase till it had spread through the Roman empire, and then to suffer it to wither away and die ? Was it to establish
 “ not a glorious church, without spot or wrinkle,
 “ holy and without stain,” but a church which should speedily revive the superstition and idolatry that he had so much laboured to extinguish ? Was it to offer to his Father, not “ a
 “ chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy
 “ nation, a purchased people, who should shew
 “ forth his praises,” but a race of men, enemies to the purity of his worship, patrons of religious ignorance, and derogators from the honour of the Father, from the mediatorship of the Son, and from the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit ? Whoever will consider the remote antiquity and wide diffusion of the Catholic faith, will acknowledge that these consequences appear to flow from the accusations preferred in the Bishop’s charge ; and if they do, where, I ask, are the invaluable blessings which Christianity has conferred on mankind ? Where the promises of Christ that his church should be built on a rock, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it ? In my opinion, and that is also the opinion of many

eminent Protestants, to ascribe such absurdities and impiety to the great body of christians during so many centuries, is to question the truth of the gospel, to libel the veracity of Christ, and to aid the infidel in his attempts to undermine the very foundations of our holy religion.*

These preliminary remarks will not, it is hoped, be deemed less interesting than the polite insinuations which occupy the first and last pages of the clergyman's letter: and may, perhaps, induce the impartial reader to suspend his assent to the confident assertions of our adversaries, till he has heard what we may say in our own defence. I shall now

* The clergyman, in a note, (p. 11,) protests against our taking the name of Catholics. I should have thought, that the prescription of so many centuries would have given us as clear a title to the name of Catholics, as our adversaries can have to that of Protestants. As the English church has not had the presumption, like the magnanimous parent of the reformation, to insert in the creed the *holy Christian church*, instead of the *holy Catholic church*, I trust the clergyman will acknowledge that such a church somewhere exists. Now if it be not our church, I would ask him what church it is. Is it the collection of sects which have sprung from the reformation? But then it would not be Catholic. For as they are the smaller number, they cannot claim an universality, which they would deny to us, though incomparably more numerous. Does he conceive that it is a theological hodge podge, a farrago of all the religions which believe in the gospel? Then it cannot be holy; for we should form the principal part of it; and our doctrines, he knows, are so far from being holy, that they are impious and idolatrous, derogatory from the honour of God the Father, from the mediatorship of God the Son, and from the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. I think then he had better leave us in the quiet possession of our old inheritance.

proceed to the matter-of-fact enquiry. The Right Reverend prelate had drawn up his bill of impeachment with all the formality and accuracy of an attorney-general. It was divided into three heads, and each head contained several different counts. As both the Remarker and his opponent have followed the order laid down by the Bishop, I shall not think myself at liberty to deviate from it. Each observation of any importance I shall discuss with patience: minor exceptions I shall neglect. To reply to them would swell this pamphlet beyond its natural size. An objection may be compressed within a single line: its refutation may demand several pages.

1. The first charge is idolatry: a charge as old as the reformation; but which has been long since abandoned and ridiculed by the more candid and moderate of our opponents. To the Bishop of Durham, Elijah Index, and the clergyman of the diocese of Durham, we may oppose the more respectable names of Thorndike and Grotius, of Bishop Parker and Bishop Montague.* Were their re-

* I will add Mr Thorndike's argument. It is obscure but solid. "They which profess the only true Christ, and therefore the only true God, do necessarily profess to detest all idolatry. And so doth the Church of Rome still as seriously profess, as they who charge them to be idolaters. And therefore cannot easily be convinced to profess idolatry. For without expressly renouncing this profession, they cannot expressly be idolaters." Just Weights, p. 6. Hence he infers: "Should this church (as the Bishop of Durham has done) declare that the change which we call reformation, is grounded on this supposition; I then must acknowledge that we be the schismatics." p. 7.

spective merits to be weighed in the balance, our modern accusers would, I suspect, fly up and kick the beam, though they were to take with them as make-weights, the book of homilies and the statute of Charles the second.* In his charge, the Bishop made, but did not take the trouble to prove, the accusation. The author of the Remarks was content in reply to refer him to the following question and answer in the Catholic catechism. Q. “ *Do Catholics pray to images?*” A. “ *No, by no means, for they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us.*” He had flattered himself that the testimony of an authorised catechism would have subdued the scepticism of the most incredulous. But he was disappointed. The prejudices of education are stubborn things: they frequently refuse to yield even to the clearest evidence. The dispute is not to be decided, replies the Durham clergyman, by an answer which may be given by rote, but by the practice of those who give it. Now this answer appears to me no very favourable sample of his boasted sincerity. I should rather consider it as the trick of a controversial juggler, the artifice of some theological Proteus,

Mille adde catenas

Effugiet tamen hæc sceleratus vincula Proteus.

Few of my readers will, I conceive, be inclined to think that any church can teach her disciples to

* Homily 2, on the peril of idolatry. 30 Charles ii. c. 1.

believe one doctrine in theory, and to follow the contrary in practice; can lanch her anathemas against those who approve, and yet countenance the conduct of those who adopt, the idolatrous worship of images. An ingenuous opponent would rather have said, “ I acknowledge that
 “ your church condemns idolatry as forcibly as
 “ our own: nor have I yet discovered any traces
 “ of that impiety among the Catholics of this coun-
 “ try. Yet, if we may believe the testimony of tra-
 “ vellers, there is reason to fear that foreign Ca-
 “ tholics cannot be entirely exempted from the
 “ imputation.” To such an opponent I would answer, that in the testimony of travellers much must be allowed to the prejudices of education: that a person who leaves this country with the conviction that Catholics worship images, will naturally conclude that the first Catholic whom he sees kneeling before a crucifix, is addressing his prayers not to Christ but to the image: that in foreign countries, expressions and demonstrations of respect have not the same value or import as in England; and that if some should be found, whose conduct it would be difficult to justify, yet candour would forbid that their guilt should be imputed to those by whom it is abhorred and condemned. Where are superstitions more prevalent, than among the vulgar in many parts of England? Yet he would be an unjust critic, who should impute them as a crime to the established clergy.

The incredulity of the Durham clergyman has

induced me to examine with greater accuracy the contents of the Catholic catechisms. With this view I have consulted not only those which are in use among the English Catholics, but also many of those which are adopted in France, Spain, Italy, Flanders, and Germany: and in all without exception have I found every species of idolatry condemned in the most pointed terms. Now if he will consider the earnestness with which the Catholic clergy are generally accustomed to impress on the minds of children the doctrine of the catechism, the familiar manner in which they study to explain it, and the diligence with which they repeat their instructions every week, and often several times in the week, I think he will be induced to pause before he again ventures to charge Catholics with a practice, which they so emphatically reprobate. But from catechisms, let me lead him to an authority, which he cannot refuse, to the decree of the council of Trent. He himself appears to acknowledge that he would free the Catholics from the guilt of idolatry, were they exempt from the impious persuasion that there exists any inherent power or divinity in their images.* Now in the very chapter to which he refers his reader, the council expressly declares that in images there does not reside any divinity, or power on account of which they ought to be worshipped: that nothing ought to be asked from

* The Clergyman's Letter, p. 11.

them ; and that no confidence should be placed in them.* If this declaration do not satisfy him, I beg he will have the goodness to compose one for us, more explicit and more intelligible.

Here, perhaps, it may not be improper to point out the origin of this accusation. It is our doctrine that pious pictures and images ought not to be treated with disrespect, under the false pretence that they are idols : and this doctrine, reprobated as it formerly was with contempt and detestation, is now, I observe, gradually making its way into the creed of the Established Church, in proportion as the fanaticism of the first reformers subsides, and reason and common sense recover their authority. The piety of our fathers, two centuries ago, would have condemned the works of Raphael and Michael Angelo to the flames and the mattock, had they discovered them in their churches : but modern protestants have learned that they can pray in the presence of a painting or a statue without experiencing any impediment to their devotion, or any temptation to idolatry. It is unfortunate that similar sentiments did not animate their progenitors. We should not now have to lament our inferiority in the elegant productions of the chissel and the pencil ; nor would our native artists be compelled to visit foreign countries that

* Non quod credatur inesse aliqua in eis divinitas, vel virtus propter quam sint colendæ : vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum ; vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda. Con. Trid. Sess. 25.

they may study the master-pieces of the painter and the statuary. It is, indeed, true, that besides the prohibition of disrespect, our church also maintains it to be lawful to treat them with respect, in as much as they are the representations of our Blessed Redeemer, and of his faithful followers; and this respect has been by our adversaries, with as much injustice as ingenuity, transubstantiated into an idolatrous worship. I could, however, wish they would, once at least, inform us in what idolatry consists. Is it in paying divine worship to images? Such worship we condemn as sincerely as themselves. The respect which we allow, is of a much inferior, a very different, description. It is the same as a subject may pay to the effigy of his sovereign, such as nature prompts a child to pay to the portrait of a deceased parent.* Or is any respect whatever idolatrous? Then the Christians of the east were idolaters, when they were accustomed to burn incense before the statues of the Christian emperors: the peers of the united kingdom are idolaters, as often as they make a reverence to the vacant throne; the Protestants of the Established Church are idolaters, as often as they kneel before the consecrated bread and wine. For what are the consecrated bread and wine? “ Mere bodily elements of earthly

* According to the council of Nice, *τιμηλικὴν προσκυνησιν, οὐ μὲν τὴν καλὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀληθινὴν λαλῶσαν, ἣ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θεῷ φύσει.* Bin. Con. Tom. v. p. 198.

“ manufacture,” replies the Bishop of Durham. But if the Protestant may kneel before these “ bodily elements of earthly manufacture,” without committing idolatry, because he directs his attention to the worship of God, I hope the Catholic, for the same reason, may kneel before a crucifix of earthly manufacture, and be equally free from guilt. *With what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged : and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.**

I shall moreover observe, that in the sacred writings occur many instances of a respect paid to inanimate objects, which cannot, without impiety, be termed idolatrous. Thus, in the Old Testament, God commanded Moses to walk barefoot on Mount

* I shall here add the opinion of Bishop Montague. “ The pictures of Christ, the blessed virgin and saints, may be made, had in houses, set up in churches. The Protestants use them : they despight them not. Respect and honour may be given unto them. The Protestants do it, and use them for helps of piety.” Gagger, p. 318. In almost every language the words which denote veneration and respect, are of ambiguous signification, and their purport must frequently be fixed by the nature of the object, and the intention of the agent. Thus, 1 Chron. xxix. 20, it is said that all the congregation *worshipped* God and the king. Now this ambiguity has furnished an ample field for the invectives of our adversaries. Because the word *worship* is now generally confined to the honour due to the Divine Being, many controversialists argue as if it had never had any other meaning : yet some vestiges of its ancient signification still remain in the title of worshipful, which we give to magistrates, and in the marriage ceremony, when the husband addresses the bride with these solemn words,—*With my body I thee worship.*

Horeb, because *it was holy ground*. From the period of the fabrication of the ark, to the time in which it was placed in the temple, we have several instances of the respect which the Israelites were ordered to bear it, and of the severe punishments which God inflicted on those who either touched it, or looked on it, with irreverence or inattention. Yet what was this ark, the object of so much veneration to the children of Israel? A square chest of wood, in which were contained the tables of the law, and perhaps the rod of Aaron, and the golden pot of Manna. In the New Testament, we are commanded to bow the knee at the name of Jesus; and in the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, and the eighteenth canon of the second year of James I., it is ordered, that “at the name of Jesus due reverence
 “be made of all persons, young and old, with low-
 “ness of courtesie, and uncovering of the heads of
 “mankind, as thereunto doth necessarily belong.”* Now it will, in my opinion, require some ingenuity to explain, why it should be a *duty* to bow when I hear the sound of his name, and a *crime* to bow when I see the representation of his sufferings. In both instances the real object of my respect is the same,—the only difference is in the organ of perception. In the former the ear is affected by the motion of the fluid, which is the vehicle of sound; in the latter the eye is affected by the impulse of the rays of light. By both I mean to honour the

* Wilkin's Con. vol. iv. p. 188, 382.

Redeemer of mankind ; and if the first mode be lawful and pious, the other cannot be unlawful and impious.

In opposition to this doctrine, our matter-of-fact enquirer adduces, what he considers as a matter of fact, that some among the most celebrated divines of the Church of Rome, Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Cajetan, assert the highest kind of adoration, *latria*, to be due to the images of God.* Were this really the case, it would not invalidate the doctrine which I have laid down in the preceding pages. I have undertaken to vindicate the creed of the Catholic church, not to justify all the extravagant opinions which may have been hazarded by ingenious men in her communion. If he expect this from me, I hope he will also, on his side, accept the office of vindicating a small portion of the impious, impure, and immoral doctrines advanced and taught, not by private divines, but by the magnanimous fathers of the reformation. We should neither of us have a very pleasant, or a very easy task. However, in the present instance, the Catholic writers whom he has impeached, stand not in need of any apology. The doctrine which, from his language, we should expect to find in their works, was most foreign from their real belief. I do not accuse his

* Clergyman's Letter, p. 13. I shall take no advantage of his mistake in inserting *God* instead of *Christ*. It is not even agreed among Catholic divines whether it be lawful to make images or representations of God.

sincerity: inattention, perhaps, to the purport of their language, or zeal for the honour of his bishop, or, what is still more probable, confidence in the assertions of some former controversialist, prompted him to misrepresent their doctrine. If then, in my attempt to explain it, I lead the reader among the metaphysical subtleties of the ancient schoolmen, the blame, I trust, will not attach to me, but to him who has imposed the obligation on me.

To illustrate their meaning, it will, perhaps, be most convenient to employ a comparison. It will probably be conceded to me, that a husband may feel a sincere affection for his wife, and consequently may entertain a regard for her picture. Now let us suppose two idle logicians, fond of wrangling, undertake to discuss the real nature of this affection, and this regard. One of them shall maintain that they are of different natures, as the affection has for its object an animate, the regard an inanimate being. The other, with equal pertinacity, shall contend, that they may be said to be both of the same nature, because of both, though the immediate object be different, the ultimate object is the same: both are ultimately referred to the wife. The reader may smile at these subtleties, but I trust he will not thence infer that the second reasoner considered the picture as of equal value with the lady, or that he was a friend to conjugal infidelity. Now this is a case in point: it is precisely the dispute of the old schoolmen. One party con-

tended that as the worship of Christ, and respect for his image or picture, had two different immediate objects, they were of two different natures. Their opponents contended that as both were ultimately referred to the same object, Christ, they might both be said to be of the same nature. This was the important subject of the dispute. The reader may smile, or lament that ingenious men should give their attention to such trifles, but certainly he will not infer that the patrons of the latter opinion considered the image of Christ as equally worthy of adoration with Christ himself, or that they taught and enforced the practice of idolatry. As to the impiety of worshipping Christ and his representation in the same manner, both parties were agreed. Their debate was about words, not things; and they never could have suspected that these metaphysical subtleties could have exposed them to so severe and unmerited an imputation.* Trusting then that what I have already said will prove satisfactory to every unprejudiced judge, I shall here close this subject with the observation of the learned Protestant divine, Mr Thorndike:—*Let not them (who charge the papists to be idolaters) lead the people by the nose,*

* The Clergyman's quotation from Bellarmine (p. 13) merely evinces the great anxiety of that divine to prevent even metaphysical disputes, which might be the occasion of error to the unlearned.

*to believe that they can prove their supposition when they cannot.**

It is with considerable reluctance that I proceed to the next accusation. For the honour of its author, I wish I could pass it over unnoticed. Disgraceful as it must prove to us, if it be true: still more disgraceful will it be to him, if it be false. I do not impeach his sincerity; but if on the word of another he publish a calumny to the world, he

* Just Weights, p. 11.

The Clergyman (p. 14) produces a few texts from Scripture with an air of triumph. Seldom, perhaps, were these sacred volumes more palpably misapplied. In Isaiah, xl. the prophet describes the power of God in the deliverance of his people from the Babylonian captivity, and then asks, To whom they can liken him? The artists of Babylon could make representations of their gods, but what likeness could represent the omnipotent and eternal God of Israel? And this text is gravely adduced to prove that it is unlawful to make a representation of Christ hanging on the cross! The passages from St Paul are equally irrelevant. That from Acts xvii. 29, is thus paraphrased by the learned Dr Hammond:—"God cannot be supposed to be the work of our hands, such as a piece of gold, or silver, or stone, with a signature upon it." Hammond, *hic*. He tells us (p. 15) that we are like the pagans, many of whom through their idols worshipped the great Maker of the world. This may be so; but then we must acknowledge that St Paul was not inspired, when he asserted that the things which the Gentiles sacrificed, they sacrificed to *devils* and *not to God*. 1 Cor. x. 20. See also p. 106, v. 37. The Durham clergyman may also, if he please, adore the divinity of Jupiter, whom he conceives to be the true God; I shall be content with the divine Being described to us in the sacred writings. As for Julian, he was posterior to St Paul, had been a christian, and endeavoured to soften the harsher features of paganism.

must submit to take the odium on himself. I am not to sit down in silence under a false accusation, lest the proof of my innocence should reflect on the character of my accuser. The Bishop charges the Catholic clergy with having suppressed the second commandment, in books of religious institution, that they might disguise the repugnance of their idolatrous worship to the letter of the decalogue.* This is certainly a charge of no ordinary consequence. If the Catholic clergy plead guilty, they must acknowledge themselves traitors to that God, whose ministers they are, and traitors to the people, whom it is their duty to instruct. They have corrupted the laws of their sovereign, and have put it out of the power of the people to discover their disobedience. Fortunately for us, unfortunately for his Lordship, the accusation is as absurd in itself, as it is unfounded in fact. One falsehood is assumed to give an air of plausibility to another. The crime of idolatry is taken as proved, and on this imaginary basis is built the charge of the suppression. I would ask the right reverend Prelate by what authority the commandment was suppressed? By the bull of some pope, or the decree of some council? Then let him name it, if he can. By private consent? But private consent, in a body so widely extended as the Catholic clergy, is impossible. What advantage did they expect from this suppression? Would it justify

* Bishop's Charge, p. 6, first edit.

their idolatry? No, it would aggravate its guilt. Would it conceal their impiety? From whom could it conceal it? Not from their adversaries, who would be eager to reproach them with it. Not from the more learned of their own communion, who would thus be taught to execrate their hypocrisy; but only from the more illiterate of the people, the very class from whom they had the least opposition to apprehend. How could they suppress it? Certainly by no other method than by expunging it from every bible, from every prayer-book, and from every catechism: in a word, to use the Bishop's expression, from every book of religious institution. For if they had left it in any, the fraud must have been discovered, and must have exposed them to the indignation and contempt of the public. Now it so happens that these bungling politicians have left it in every edition of the bible; and even in every catechism and every prayer-book which professes to explain the commandments at length. Let the Bishop of Durham, let any of my readers, consult such books of Catholic institution as they can procure, and they will be compelled to acknowledge the truth of this assertion.

After the first edition of the Bishop's Charge, the Remarker gently admonished him of his mistake. Whether his Lordship thought it worth his while to enquire into the truth or falsehood of the admonition, I know not: but two editions of his work have since been published, and the accu-

sation still stands unblushingly in its original form. Some Protestant writers, however, have made the experiment which was recommended, and the result has been a conviction, which they have publicly expressed, of our innocence. But evidence, which may be deemed satisfactory in other parts of the kingdom, is condemned to lose its force in the diocese of Durham. Prejudice appears to have drawn a magic circle around us, impermeable to the rays of truth. First our Jewish friend Elijah, and next the Durham clergyman have come forward to substantiate the justice of the accusation. Elijah perished by his own weapon, and died *felo de se*. The clergyman approaches with a load of erudition, but which is of little service to his cause, and of less to his “sincerity.” His pamphlet bears sufficient testimony that he had consulted, with no ordinary degree of diligence, Catholic books of religious institution, not only those of easy access, but also those which for near two centuries have been neglected and forgotten. He has told us, that in four Catholics books, which I shall notice below,* he did not find the exact words of the se-

* In the note, he appears to have discovered, after a long and painful search, seven books, in which the express words of the sacred text are wanting : but, as of these, four are only different editions or translations of the same treatise, I may reduce them to the number mentioned above. One of these is entitled *Officium B. Mariæ Virginis*, at the commencement of which the printer, of his own authority, added a small tract of three pages, called *Insti-*

cond commandment : but he has not told us in how many he did find them. I will, however, for once appeal to his boasted sincerity : and will venture to assert, that if he have the courage to speak the truth, he must acknowledge, that for one Catholic book in which he did not read the words in question, he discovered twenty in which he did. I will also tell him in what books he or any of his friends may read them. They may read them in every edition of the bible that has been printed by Catholics, in any language. They may read them in the different authorised catechisms to which I have also referred in the note below :* and

tutio Hominis Christiani, in which occurs an abstract of the decalogue, without the prohibition, in express words, of idol-worship. The other three books are catechisms by Vaux, Ledesma, and Du Roy, names that I dare assert not one Catholic in a thousand has heard of before. Vaux was an Englishman, an exile for his faith, and a schoolmaster in Germany : he composed and published a catechism in 1567. He does not indeed give the very words of what Protestants call the second commandment, but he refers to them *Exod. c. xx.* informs us that all idolatry is prohibited, and that the reverence which may lawfully be given to the images of Christ and his saints, is the same as that which we give to parents, superiors, and other reverend persons. The catechisms of Ledesma and Du Roy I have not been able to procure. They are, probably, as free from all just reason of censure. To these he might have added an Irish prayer-book, in which the words are omitted : yet the same prayer-book forbids all kind of idolatry.

* *Catechismus Romanus*, part 3. *Institutiones Christianæ pietatis a Petro Canisio*. (To this Vaux was much indebted.) *Catechismo di Napoli*, par. 3. The Flemish catechisms : *Christelyke leering voor de Chtholycke jonkeyt*, p. 30. *Christelyke*

they may also read them in almost every Catholic book of popular instruction.

Here I may be allowed to ask two questions. 1. By what system of casuistry can a sincere and ingenuous adversary reconcile it with his conscience, to accuse a church of suppressing a particular doctrine, because, though he has discovered it in the majority, he has not discovered it in a few, of the books written by members of her communion? 2. By what laws of reasoning can a fair disputant attempt to shew that a church endeavours to conceal a doctrine from the eyes of the people, when she publishes it in almost every book, which she exhorts them to read? It must be evident that, if the words of the commandment are not fully expressed in every catechism, the omission cannot be justly attributed to the cause which it has pleased the zeal of our adversaries to assign: and that they may not in future be obliged to plead their ignorance as an excuse, I hope they will have no objection to learn the true reason. It is well known, that for many centuries before the birth of the reformation, the Catholics were accustomed to arrange, on the authority of St Augustine, the decalogue in such manner, that whatever regarded

underwizing, p. 167. The German catechism, *Catholischer Catechismus*, Hamburg, 1769. The French catechisms, *de Montpellier, des Eveques, de Meaux*, or that lately published for the use of the French empire. The English catechisms, &c. If these be not sufficient to convince him, I will furnish him with fifty more.

the worship of God should be comprised under one division. Thus, what Protestants call the first and second commandments we call the first. The relative merit of the two divisions is foreign to the present subject. I merely state the case. Now as children among Catholics are taught the catechism almost as soon as they begin to lisp, it was thought adviseable to abridge the commandments, for their use, so that each precept should be confined to one line, which generally is in rhyme. The commandment in question was expressed in these or similar words. *One God alone thou shalt adore.* Now it is evident, that here can be no intention of suppressing the prohibition of idolatry. 1. Because even these words prohibit it: 2. Because as the children grew up, they were compelled to learn the larger catechism, in which the commandments are repeated at full length, and the prohibition is carefully enforced in the questions and answers. It is tedious to be so diffuse upon trifles. Had the accusation been made by some obscure controversialist, I should have treated it with the neglect it deserved: but it derives importance from the dignity of its author, and from the repeated though feeble efforts of his apologists. It was therefore a duty to display our own innocence, and to remind our adversaries, that besides the prohibition of idolatry, the decalogue contains another precept: *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.**

* Page 17 is beneath criticism. The Durham clergyman

In the progress of his reasoning, the Bishop's antipathy to the Catholic faith drew from him an argument, at which candour and liberality would blush. The Remarker disdained to give it a direct answer, but hurled it back with contempt to his opponents. If it were conclusive, it would undermine the whole fabric of the established church: he therefore desired them to solve it themselves. The attempt has been made. Elijah made it, and ended by abjuring the Athanasian creed.* The clergyman endeavours to improve the argument by illustration, and his illustration has exposed it in all its nakedness. He states it in this manner: "We cannot be surprised that those who believe bread and wine to be the real body and blood of Christ, that is, truly God, and deserving di-

seems to be alarmed with the consciousness that he has undertaken a weak cause. His imagination is perpetually conjuring up spectres to affright him. At every step he fancies himself caught in a trap laid by his crafty adversary. The bishop had said: "To disguise such repugnance to the letter of God's commandment, an artifice was adopted, &c." To what did *such repugnance* refer? To the practice of Catholics. Where then was the dishonest expedient, to make the bishop say, that the practice of Catholics was repugnant to the letter of God's commandment? The clergyman says that the bishop *does not* found his censure on that ground. I am happy to learn it. Our doctrine then is *now* confessed not to be contrary to the letter of the commandment. But he *did* found his censure on that ground: and if he did not think it repugnant to the letter of the commandment, why did he assert that we had suppressed the commandment in order to conceal its repugnance to the letter?

* A Protestant's Reply, p. 10.

“ vine worship, as such, should likewise, without
 “ much difficulty, believe, that an image may
 “ partake of the divine nature of Christ, and may
 “ therefore deserve, as such, the worship due to
 “ God ; that if the body and blood of Christ may
 “ subsist under the accidents of bread and wine,
 “ they may also subsist under the accidents of car-
 “ ven wood, or molten brass.” To refute such emp-
 ty reasoning is of itself an humiliation. Without
 adverting to the inaccuracy of the expression in the
 first part of the argument, it may be sufficient to
 reply :—That we believe the body and blood of
 Christ to subsist under the accidents or ap-
 pearances of bread and wine, because he has ex-
 pressly asserted that they do : but that he has not
 asserted that they subsist under the accidents or
 appearances, of carven wood, or molten brass.
 What reason then can we have to worship either
 carven wood or molten brass ?

The clergyman proceeds to shew that the argu-
 ment, as retorted by the Remarker, does not ap-
 ply to the right reverend Prelate. I must ac-
 knowledge, that in this part of his pamphlet I
 should have more admired, not only his powers of
 reasoning, but also his sincerity, had he not
 “ adopted an artifice, proscribed by the laws of
 “ literary warfare.” The three whole pages which
 he devotes to the solution of the difficulty, do not
 even remotely refer to it. They indeed prove, that
 the belief of the divinity of Christ is no supersti-
 tion, which the Remarker did not dispute ; but

they do not prove that any answer can be given to the Unitarian by the Protestant, which, in the mouth of a Catholic, will not be equally powerful against the Bishop. I shall, therefore, take the liberty briefly to restate the argument of the Remarker, and to solicit an answer from some of the admirers of the charge. If to believe that the body and blood of Christ can subsist under the appearances of bread and wine, necessarily *dispose* the Catholic to worship the creature image instead of the Creator ; it follows that to believe the Divinity existed on earth with a body made of the same flesh, and subject to the same infirmities as our own, must also *dispose* the Protestant to worship the creature image instead of the Creator. If the Bishop or his apologist reply by proving the divinity of Christ, I hope they will also approve of the answer which I have given in the preceding paragraph. If they prefer any other mode of reasoning, I will pledge myself to shew that it will equally furnish a solution of the argument employed by the Prelate against the Catholics.*

* The Clergyman denies that the scripture is as clear for transubstantiation as for the divinity of Christ. This is, I fear, a shuffle. What the Remarker contended for was the real presence of the body of Christ in the eucharist : when once that is settled, it will be time enough to decide whether it be there by transubstantiation or by any other means. Till this be done, I will, with his permission, undertake to produce texts as evident in favour of the real presence, as he shall produce in favour of the divinity of Christ. As to the assertion that the belief of the divinity of Christ is very different from a tenet, which is contradicted by the evidence of the senses, and can be proved to be true only by destroy-

With a light and indulgent hand, the author of the Remarks had ventured to touch an ancient sore, the established doctrine on the subject of the Lord's supper. His sacrilegious temerity has alarmed the piety, and provoked the indignation of my opponent. That learned clerk seems to fancy that the Catholic tenets alone are fair and open game. At them every hungry or ill-natured divine, every hunter after favour and preferment, may direct the shafts of ridicule and misrepresentation. It is one of the graces of the reformation; an appendage to the liberty of the children of God. But the doctrines approved in the thirty-nine articles are sacred things. If a Catholic writer presume to enter the veil of the sanctuary, to draw them out of their obscurity, and exhibit them in their native colours, a thousand arms are raised to lash his arrogance and impiety. The Remarker had observed that the Protestant doctrine on the Lord's

ing the foundations of our assent to all truth, I ask whether the divinity of our Saviour was not contradictory to the evidence of the senses? The Clergyman proves that he was God, not from the immediate testimony of sense, but by arguing from his actions and declarations, that though in appearance he was man, yet he also was God. In like manner, do we not argue from the words of our Saviour, that though the eucharist be in appearance bread and wine, yet in reality it is the body and blood of Christ? If I perfectly understand my opponent, I should not doubt that, had he been present at the baptism of Jesus, he would not have believed in the descent of the Holy Ghost over his sacred person, lest he should destroy the foundations of our assent to all truth. He perhaps never learned that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."—Rom. x. 17.

supper, appeared to his judgment something like nonsense. It was, indeed, a harsh expression; but I do not conceive that it could offend the ears of those, who so liberally bestow the terms of absurdity, superstition, and idolatry, on their adversaries. Neither do I think that it were very difficult to vindicate the propriety of his language. Let us go to the catechism, which the Durham clergyman is supposed to teach, and to the thirty-nine articles, which he has subscribed. The catechism is meant for the use of children; we may, therefore, conclude that it is accommodated to the weakness of their capacity, and drawn up in plain and perspicuous language. Now in this catechism we are taught “that the body and blood of Christ
“are verily and indeed received by the faithful in
“the Lord’s supper.” May I then ask, whether the body and blood of Christ be there, or not? They are not, replies my opponent; nothing more is received than the graces, which Christ’s sacrificed body can yield us. Now I appeal to any person acquainted with the English language, whether to receive Christ’s body and blood *verily* and *indeed*, can naturally mean any other thing than to receive it in very truth and deed;* and whether the Re-

* “The declaration against transubstantiation, says the Annual Review, is yet extorted from members of the house of commons, although the Church of England consecrates that doctrine by maintaining that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed received by the faithful at the Lord’s supper. This may be called consubstantiation by Lutheran sophistry; but it only

marker committed a very egregious blunder when he asserted that to receive in the Lord's supper, in very truth and deed, that which was acknowledged not to be in the Lord's supper, appeared to his judgment something like nonsense. But from the catechism let us proceed to the articles. Had the bishops and doctors, to whose learning and ingenuity we owe them, being possessed of the clear preceptions of the Durham clergyman, they would have told us, that the instrumental cause, by which we are put in actual possession of *all* the graces which Christ's crucified body can yield us, is given, taken, and eaten, in the Lord's supper. This doctrine, whether it be true or false, would at least have had the merit of being intelligible. But they, poor souls, went a more awkward way to work; they were like the man,

—— Who now to sense, now nonsense leaning,
Means not, but blunders round about a meaning.

They thought it best to declare that the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the mean whereby it is received and eaten is faith.

removes the transubstantiation of the sacramental elements from the chalice of the priest to the mouth of the communicant. We comprehend not, how any evangelical christian, or sincere member of the Church of England, can assent to this declaration without feeling the remorse of perjury."—Review for 1806, p. 565, 566.

Now, that the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, is the doctrine of Catholics, and necessarily flows from our belief in the real presence: for though his body be really there, it is only there after a spiritual and heavenly manner. But this cannot be the true meaning of the article; and to understand it, we must conceive “the body of Christ” to be a metaphorical expression for the “graces which his body can yield us.” The mean whereby the body is received and eaten is faith. This appears to me equally unintelligible. Whatever may be understood by faith (I suspect it to be an assurance of salvation, and then fanatics only will receive the graces of Christ’s body), it is evident from it that the unfaithful do not eat the body of Christ. Now if this had been the doctrine of the apostle, I suspect he would not have said, that the unworthy communicant is *guilty*, but that he is *deprived* of the body and blood of Christ.* This at least, will, I trust, be conceded to me, that no man could, from the mere perusal of the article, deduce either what then was, or now is, the real doctrine of the established church. Whence then, I may perhaps be asked, did this

* On this subject I will refer the reader to Bishop Beveridge’s explanation of the catechism, p. 145. It is amusing enough to observe with what ingenuity the right reverend prelate gradually slides through three pages from the body and blood of Christ, till he at last rests on a secure standing place, the graces of the body and blood of Christ.

obscurity arise? Was it intentional or unintentional? Had the framers of the articles no fixed notions on the subject, or did they differ in their respective sentiments? If I might be allowed to reveal the scandalous secret, I would say that the whole business was a mere politico-theological juggle. The fathers of the reformation could agree in repudiating the Catholic creed: they could not agree in any other to substitute in its place. Truth is one: it is the centre of the circle; recede from it, and you may wander to any point of the circumference. The new doctors, in the pride of evangelical liberty, believed one day one thing, and another day another; and as men and circumstances changed, the creed of the English church was improved or corrupted by successive alterations. The first book of common-prayer was a work of godly travel: the commons, lords, and infant head of the church, pronounced it to have been composed with the aid of the Holy Ghost;* and in this second gospel the communion was ordered to be delivered with the following words:—*The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life.* But it was soon discovered that this form savoured of the corruption of popery; within a few years, though it had been adopted by the aid of the Holy Ghost, it was expunged, and a new form substituted by the aid of the same divine spirit. The eu-

* 2 and 5 Ed. VI. c. i.

charist was no longer the body of Christ ; by the magic touch of an act of parliament, it was converted into a bare remembrance of his death :* *Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee ; and feed on him in thy heart by faith and thanksgiving.* At the same time the articles of religion were framed, and by them it was declared, that *it did not become any of the faithful to profess that there is a real or corporal presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy eucharist.* This new form, with the declaration in the articles, gave offence to many whose minds could not keep pace with the principal reformers, in the godly career of innovation ; and in the third of Elizabeth it was determined to quiet their alarms, and to allure them to the established church, by adopting a language more conformable to their feelings and belief. Hence, in the delivery of the communion, both the forms of Edward VI. were ordered to be united, that the objections of the Catholic might be removed, without offending the scruples of the orthodox believer ; and in the article, the denial of the real presence was obliterated, and in its stead an explication introduced, which, according to the prejudices or judgment of the reader, might, from the manner in which it was worded, denote either the real existence or the real non-existence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's supper. This, I believe, will prove to be the true history of

* 5 and 6 of Ed. VI. c. 1.

the obscurity which prevails in every official document on the nature of the sacrament ; the best interpretation of the unknown tongue, under which the established church has chosen to veil her real sentiments.*

2. On the invocation of saints, the clergyman asks one question, and hazards two observations. He asks, whether in the supposition that their intercession be solicited, not with Christ, but with God the Father, or the blessed Trinity, the Remarker be willing to allow that an injury is done to the one mediatorship of Christ ? I will answer for the Remarker in the negative, provided their intercession be supposed to rest on the merits of Christ. Now if he will take the trouble to look at the five prayers which he has transcribed, he will find that they all end with the words “ *Through Christ our Lord.*”

He asserts that when Protestants pray for their fellow-creatures here upon earth, their prayers are imputed to their own account. “ We may hope, “ indeed, but dare not affirm, that they may “ sometimes be serviceable to them who are the “ subjects of them.” If this doctrine be true, it must follow, that St Paul was no Protestant ; for he desired the Romans to pray for him, not that their prayers might be imputed to them, but that *he* might be delivered from the unbelievers.† I

* See Gilbert, Bishop of Sarum, on the 39 articles, art. 28.

† Rom. xv. 30, 31.

even tremble for the orthodoxy of the venerable Bishop of London himself, who exhorts every sincere christian to persevere in that most *benevolent* office of interceding for all mankind.* Were the learned Prelate to study theology at the feet of our Durham Gamaliel, he would learn that to intercede for others, instead of being a benevolent, was a selfish office; that it might indeed be imputed to us, but no one could affirm that it was beneficial to them. From what part of the sacred text did the clergyman glean this article of his creed?†

He proceeds to insinuate, that when Catholics solicit the intercession of the blessed in heaven, it is “because they dare not address our Redeemer
“for mercy, dare not rely on his merits alone for
“the acceptance of their sincere and humble sup-
“plications; of consequence, that they distrust
“and dishonour his mediation, and, by such
“usages, deserve the censure of every zealous
“christian.” I must again beg of him to look at the example of St Paul. When that apostle desired the Romans to pray for his deliverance, was it “because he durst not address his Redeemer,

* Sermons, vol. ii. p. 381.

† Perhaps from Gen. xviii. 32, where God promises, upon Abraham's intercession, to spare Sodom for the sake of ten men, if ten righteous men were found in it; perhaps from Exodus, xxxii. 30, where Moses makes atonement for the sin of the people; perhaps from Job xlii. 7, where the Lord receives the intercession of Job for his friends.

“ or rely on his mercy alone for the acceptance of
 “ his supplication ?” Did he then “ distrust
 “ and dishonour the mediation of Christ, and
 “ deserve the censure of every zealous christian ?”
 Either St Paul was ignorant of the rudiments of
 christian theology, or our new teacher has yet to
 learn them.

The next subject in the order of the Bishop's charge is that of penance. To learn on what terms the sinner may expect to make his peace with an offended God, is certainly a matter of great importance, and, from its importance, must forcibly arrest the attention of those who undertake to frame a religious creed. In the primitive church, the penitent sinner was condemned to a long course of fasting and austerity, and this discipline was then conceived to be founded on the clearest evidence of the inspired writings. When the reformation began to prosper, there was reason to fear that its authors, from their *known* partiality to primitive fervour and primitive doctrine, would introduce the ancient system ; but fortunately for mankind, they compassionated the weakness of our nature, and instead of subjecting their disciples to the penitential canons of past ages, very liberally emancipated them, even from the restraints which popery still continued to impose upon sinners. Now as the Bishop had condemned the Catholic doctrine on the subject of penance, it was not rash to infer that he concurred in opinion with the fathers of his faith ; and the Remarker had in

consequence commented on his right reverend adversary with some degree of severity. His comments have provoked the indignation of the clergyman, who feels, or affects to feel, for the insult offered to his Bishop, and, with a Stentorian voice, accuses the Remarker of "a gross and "glaring perversion of the opinion of the prelate." "It would be a mockery," he exclaims, "to pretend to think it unintentional; it would be a "mere affectation of charity to regard your insulting tone," &c. &c.*

— Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ!

If I know the Remarker, he would not, I am sure, pervert or misrepresent the opinion of any man, much less of so respectable a prelate as the Bishop of Durham. But is it certain that the Bishop's opinion has been perverted? By condemning the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as a denial of the efficacy of Christ's passion, does he not also deny the necessity of works of penance? Is it not his opinion, that nothing more is necessary for repentance than sorrow for past sin, and a sincere desire to amend in future? If I am mistaken, I shall be happy to acknowledge my mistake; but if I am not, does not his doctrine then whisper these comfortable words into the ear of the sinner? *You need not fear the rigours of*

* Clergyman's Letter, p. 50.

penance. To weep and pray, to fast and give alms, to repent in sackcloth and ashes, belonged only to the Jewish dispensation. All that is now required is to be sorry, and amend; and this may be done when you can sin no longer. I do not mean to say that the right reverend prelate would preach in this manner; but I maintain that his doctrine, supposing it to be as I have conceived it, will naturally lead to such consequences.

But let us listen to the declamation of the clergyman. In his zeal to convict the Remarker, he has had the misfortune to condemn the Bishop; and while he accuses his opponent of the crime of misrepresentation, he imputes the disgrace of ignorance to his patron. The doctrine, he tells us, which the prelate meant to condemn, was that which teaches “the imposition of penances to be
“absolutely necessary to obtain pardon for sin,
“and the performance of the penance enjoined
“ (or indulgence for non-performance) to be requisite for the restoration of the sinner.” If this be all, the Remarker, I have no doubt, will subscribe to his lordship’s censure. It is a doctrine which we are as willing to anathematize as he is: it would not be suffered, without animadversion, in any Catholic writer. I am happy to find that for once we can agree.

The next point in succession is communion under one kind. I am sorry to lead the reader to such uninteresting subjects. The Bishop had, at least, the merit of exhibiting his old matter under

a new form, and, by marshalling his arguments in three divisions, was enabled to intrust one to the patronage of each of the three persons of the most blessed Trinity. This was novel and curious. But the clergyman “is a dull matter-of-fact enquirer.”* He has been content to revive antiquated objections, and to dress them in the same garb they wore two centuries ago. I am compelled to reply in the same style; and if the reader be sometimes fatigued with the dulness of the matter or the method, I hope that, instead of accusing the insipidity, he will compassionate the fate of the writer, condemned to the wearisome task of refuting sophisms, and unmasking misrepresentations, which have been refuted and unmasked a thousand times before.

The clergyman’s first observation is, that the argument from authority will weigh nothing against the express injunction of our Lord. The Remarker did not adduce it to prove that it is lawful to violate the injunction of our Lord, but to prove that no such injunction was ever given. The clergyman maintains that there was; the Remarker that there was not. Supposing them equal in judgment, the dispute must either be decided by authority, or must remain for ever undecided.†

* Clergyman’s Letter, p. 8.

† The clergyman wishes for some proof that communion under one kind was always partially admitted. I shall at present refer him to Pope Leo, *Serm. IV. de Quad. tom. i. p. 217*; Eusebius, *Hist. l. vi. c. 44, p. 200*; the Eleventh Council of To-
le-

He continues to observe, “ that the Bishop
 “ and the church of which he is a member, con-
 “ sider the wine as part of the matter of the sa-
 “ crament: that there is no authority to affirm
 “ the sacrament to be received at all, if all that
 “ constitutes the matter is not received: that
 “ there is no more reason for considering the
 “ reception of the cup as only a part of the
 “ manner, than for thinking the same of the
 “ bread also ; and that if each may be omitted se-
 “ parately, both may be omitted together.*” This
 is a most curious specimen of logical acumen. So
 then, if the Durham clergyman have a rich living
 in view, and know of two methods by either of
 which he may procure it, he will sit down in his
 chair, and thus reason coolly with himself. I may
 procure the living by either of these two methods ;
 therefore each may be omitted separately: but “ if
 “ each may be omitted separately, both may be
 “ omitted together:” therefore I will omit both,
 and I shall infallibly procure the living ! But is it
 certain that the church of which he is a member,
 teaches the wine to be part of the matter of the sa-
 crament ; and that if it be not received, there is
 no authority to affirm that the sacrament is re-
 ceived at all ? I have some reason to doubt it. 1.
 It is very probable that a great, if not the greater,

do, Concil. tom. vi. can. 11 ; St Cyprian de Lapsis, p. 153 ; St
 Augustine, Epist. 98, olim 25 ; Paulinus, Vit. St Ambrosii, No.
 47 ; Tertullian ad Uxor. lib. xi. c. 5, p. 169.

* Clergyman's Letter, p. 31.

part of the wine used in the church, is of English manufacture, that is to say, no wine at all. If then without the wine there be no sacrament, it will not be rash to assert that the communion is frequently administered to very little purpose. 2. I have a very great authority to produce against the Bishop, even the authority of his own church. In the first of Edward VI. c. 1, it was enacted, “ that the
 “ most blessed sacrament be hereafter *commonly*
 “ delivered and ministered unto the people under
 “ both kinds, that is to say, of bread and wine,
 “ except necessity otherwise require:” and the king, immediately after, in his quality of head of the church, issued a proclamation to the same effect, in the very same words. This statute was, indeed, repealed by Mary, but was re-enacted by 1. Elizabeth, c. 1. Now, unless we say that Edward, in the plenitude of his ecclesiastical power, with the concurrence of his parliament, dispensed from the injunction of Christ, it will follow that the English church did not originally conceive the wine to be an essential part of the sacrament. For those who say that one kind should not be administered *commonly*, grant that it may be done sometimes: and by specifying the case of necessity, acknowledge the propriety of the doctrine that teaches only one kind to be essential to the sacrament. But if he object to the authority of his own church, he certainly will yield to that of its great forefather, the adventurous Luther. According to that infallible divine, “ They sin not

“ against Christ, who use one kind only, seeing
 “ Christ has not commanded to use both. Though
 “ it were an excellent thing to use both kinds in
 “ the sacrament, and Christ has commanded no-
 “ thing in this as necessary, yet it were better to
 “ follow peace and unity, than to contest about
 “ kinds.” So much for authority.*

The clergyman again endeavours to prove that Christ actually commanded all christians to receive under the form of wine. The only semblance of such a command is to be found in the words—*Drink ye all of it.* Now let us consider the circumstances in which these words were spoken. Our blessed Redeemer was seated at supper with his twelve apostles : he took the bread and brake it, and divided it among them : he then took the cup, but as he could not divide it in like manner, he gave it among them, saying,—“ Drink ye all of it.” And, observes an Evangelist, “ they all drank of it.” Now these words, we are told, were addressed not only to the apostles, but also to every christian. Yet is there the least proof of the assertion ? I have never met with any. And still, because we are unwilling to submit our own judgment to that of men, who have no reason to

* Lib. de Capt. Babyl. c. de Euch. Epist. ad Bohemos, in declar. Euch. et in Serm. de Euch. I quote from an English translation, as the original Latin is not in my possession. I know he also wrote against communion in one kind ; but that reformer built his faith on scripture, and he could make scripture speak pro and con, just as it suited his purpose.

suppose themselves superior in that faculty to ourselves, and who acknowledge themselves to be the fallible disciples of a fallible church, we are to be abused as corrupters of religion, derogators from the command of Christ, and mutilators of the sacrament! As to the distinction between the matter and the manner: we acknowledge the wine to be part of the matter of the sacrifice, but we deny it to be necessarily part of the matter of the sacrament.* I could wish to know, what makes the

* In answer to the Remarker's observation on 1 Cor. xi. 27. the clergyman maintains that the true meaning is evident from the preceding verse, in which is mentioned communion in both kinds. I am not convinced that this will serve his purpose. The twenty-sixth verse is addressed in the plural number to the whole body of the Corinthian converts; and from it may be justly inferred, that the usual method of administering the communion in that city was under both kinds. But, in the next verse, the apostle changes his language, and addresses them individually, and tells them that whosoever ate or drank unworthily, was guilty of the body and blood of the Lord: from which it may with equal justice be inferred that, though the principal part of the congregation received under both kinds, some received under one only. The clergyman is unwilling to relinquish the *and* in the English version. He says, that though the edition in which the Remarker may read the Greek testament has the disjunctive *or*, yet several of the oldest MSS. and versions have the copulative *and*. I could wish to learn in what edition he has ever read the Greek testament with the copulative *and*. I suspect in none: and notwithstanding the authority of his MSS. and versions, I have never yet met with any editor, who has had the boldness to foist it into the text. In the old version of the English established church (so I am assured, for I have not the means of consulting it) originally the disjunctive *or* was retained. But it was then the doc-

clergyman so positive, that wine is part of the matter? The scripture, indeed, mentions the cup, but it no where mentions that the liquor which it contained was wine; and, if I mistake not, according to Protestant principles, nothing is to be believed as of faith, but what is expressly asserted in the holy scriptures.

3. The subject of ritual observances shall soon be dismissed. The clergyman observes that, "if they do not promote the cause of true piety, they must injure it." To this position I most cordially assent: and from it draw an inference equally favourable to the Remarker, and unfavourable to the Bishop and his advocate. If the necessary effect do not follow, we may infer that the cause does not exist: if true piety be not injured among Catholics, it will follow that their ritual observances, so far from proving injurious, are even serviceable to the cause of virtue. Now this may be decided by an easy experiment. Let the Durham clergyman compare the morals and piety of the next Catholic congregation with those of his own parishioners, and then let him say whether the former are inferior in that respect to any of

trine of the same church that communion under one kind was lawful in some cases. Now that opinion is condemned, and therefore in the new translation of James I. which is still in use, the disjunctive *or* has been magically converted into the copulative *and*. Thus it appears that the good people of England, while they are persuaded that they build their belief on the words of scripture, are in reality building it on the whims, or prejudices, or judgments, of translators and editors as fallible as themselves.

their neighbours. If he cannot, let him cease to affirm that the rites of the Catholic church are injurious to piety, or derogatory from the sanctifying influence of the holy spirit.

We cherish with respect such rites and ceremonies as really belong to our religion.* They are as monuments which attest its antiquity and authenticity: they have descended to us from our fathers, and prove that our faith is not of modern birth. Let the Durham clergyman read the oldest liturgies still extant, and he will find many of them there. Let him read the pentateuch of Moses, and the gospel, and he will find many of them there. He will learn that some are of divine origin, and others almost as ancient as christianity. It was, however, well done of the reformers to abolish them. What has a modern religion to do with ancient ceremonies? Or what has the belief of

* The clergyman objects to pilgrimages, and rosaries or beads. As to the first, they may be of advantage or disadvantage, according to circumstances. They form no part of the Catholic doctrine: they may be made or not, as may be judged proper. See an account of ancient pilgrimages in the *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon church*, vol. ii. page 122. Rosaries are also a matter of discretionary devotion. They were first adopted for the use of the vulgar, who could not read. Whether they consist of *Pater Nosters*, or of *Ave Marias*, is of little consequence. Some use one, and some the other. The *Ave Maria* consists of two passages of scripture commemorative of the incarnation of Christ, and of a petition that his holy mother would pray for us. The Durham clergyman may, if he please, become an orthodox Catholic, and never repeat it to his death.

the metaphorical presence of Christ's body to do with rites established in honour of its real presence? He is angry that prayers of benediction should be read over the vestments used in the celebration of the mass. Let him peruse the benediction of the sacerdotal vestments recorded by Moses, or St Paul's epistle to Timothy, and he will then learn, that God himself appointed such ceremonies, and that "every creature is sanctified by the word of God and by prayer."

When the magnanimous fathers of the reformation separated from the Church of Rome, one object which engaged much of their attention, was to justify or palliate their schism. For this purpose every species of expedient was adopted; and among the Catholic doctrines which they misrepresented and vilified, was that which teaches the utility and necessity of good works. The piety of Luther urged him to retire as far as possible from the corruptions of Babylon. With one dash of his pen, he magnanimously abolished the obligation of good works, and opened the gates of heaven to every man who could only boast the gift of an all-saving faith.* This solifidian tenet, it must be acknowledged, with the Church of England in her articles, "is a most wholesome

* *Sola fides est necessaria ut justi simus, cætera omnia liberima. In cap. 2 ad Gal. Nullum peccatum inferre potest damnationem, sed sola incredulitas. De capt. Babyl. tom. ii. fol. 171. De lib. Christ. tom. v. fol. 311.*

“ doctrine, and very full of comfort.”* The restraints of religion are too unpleasant to the passions of men.

'Tis prudence to reform her into ease,
And put her in undress to make her please.
A lively faith will bear aloft the mind,
And leave the luggage of good works behind.

On this head we have undoubtedly great obligations to Luther. Our blessed Redeemer died for us, and still left the way to happiness strait and rugged; the new apostle rushed to the arms of his faithful Catharine, and made it spacious and commodious. After Christ, it was still so uninviting, that, as he declared, few would chuse to walk in it: after Luther, it was cleared of the thorns of virtue, and might with ease be trodden by thousands. His disciples, however, have gradually learnt to blush at the extravagance of their master: in the course of time they have silently abandoned his school, and have returned, on this point at least, nearer to the doctrine of scripture and common sense. But the unnatural portrait which their great patriarch had drawn of the Catholic doctrine, they still cherish with filial respect, and consider as an invaluable legacy. It appears to be at present in the joint possession of the Bishop of Durham, and the clergyman of the diocese of Durham: poor Elijah, if I may judge from his pam-

* Art. xi.

phlet, has no share in the property. The right reverend prelate, in his charge, was content to advert to what he called the presumptuous doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning the merit of good works; and the author of the Remarks demonstrated in reply, that this presumption existed no where but in the heated imagination of his lordship. The clergyman will not permit such an answer to escape uncensured. In the most forcible language, he contends that his caricature is a faithful likeness, and that the pencil of the Remarker has treacherously concealed every harsh and forbidding feature. “ You tell us something,” he exclaims, “ but you do not tell us all. Does not your church also require you to believe that good works actually *merit* their reward, and that they may do more than merit it? That, unprofitable servants as you are, some among you may yet bestow of their superabundant goodness, to improve the condition and alleviate the punishment of their less righteous brethren?” Such interrogations appear to him equal to a victory; and he concludes, at some distance, with advising the Remarker “ never more to yield to the tempting hope of strengthening his cause by stratagems, which have been hitherto proscribed by the laws of literary warfare.” As to his advice, his opponent, probably, would send him to those lines of the poet:—

Dii te, Damasippe, deæque

Verum ob consilium donent tonsore.

In answer to his questions I shall reply, that our church does *not* require us to believe either that our good works *merit* their reward, in the sense which he attaches to the word *merit*, or that they may do more than merit it, so that some among us may bestow of their superabundant goodness to their less righteous brethren. In effect, the whole controversy between us at present on this head is, I believe, a mere logomachia, “a windy war of words.” If a person promise me a reward on certain conditions with which I comply, I may, I trust, without offering considerable violence to propriety of language, say that I have merited or earned my reward; even though the reward were in its own nature to exceed the exact value of my services. However, should the propriety of the word, *merit*, be disputed, I would not contend; the acquisition of the reward would be my object, and if I obtained that, I should be content, whether I were allowed to say I merited it, or not.

From good works we naturally proceed to indulgencies; a subject which has often been discussed by Protestant writers, but with more passion than sincerity. If frequency of repetition could give to misrepresentation the substance of truth, an indulgence would be of all scandalous things the most scandalous. The Bishop of Durham seems to have adopted this principle: he conceived he might justly assume the privilege of saying what had been said by hundreds before him; and therefore, with-

out hesitation, condemned the practice of indulgences in terms the most pointed and severe. But the Remarker was not to be intimidated by an episcopal frown: he tore the visor from the face of the supposed monster; and lo, its deformity vanished, nor could the critical eye of the Durham clergyman discover in it one forbidding feature. But how was this gentleman's astonishment increased, when he learned that indulgences had also been favourites with the clergy of the established church; that his reverend brethren had frequently condescended to be the venders of wares, which he had thought the exclusive property of a lady, sometimes politely termed the w— of Babylon? He had recourse to his usual theme, the insincerity, artifice, and legerdemain of the Remarker. He accused him of having varnished over, with a deceitful gloss, the doctrine of his church; of confessing, indeed, that indulgences are remissions of ecclesiastical censure, or mitigations of punishment in this world, but of concealing that they are also “remissions of every sin, “and promises of eternal life.” Having thus shewn, as he conceives, the difference between Protestant and Catholic indulgences, he recovers his usual temper, and very charitably affects to fear for the orthodoxy of his dear friend the Remarker, to tremble lest his doctrine should involve him in the same fate with Luther, the parent of the reformation. I will endeavour to quiet his alarm. The Remarker is in no danger of meeting

with the fate of Luther in this world ; and if he will follow my advice, will not be very ambitious of sharing it with him in the other. For the information of the clergyman, I will add, that the Catholic doctrine does not teach, that indulgences are “ a remission of all sins,” or even of any sins,* or that they are “ applications of the superfluous “ merits of Christ and the saints.” The first of these assertions is contradictory to the Catholic creed ; the second is an opinion which has been maintained by speculative and ingenious men ; but it forms no part of the Catholic faith, and may, without danger of censure, be believed or disbelieved according to the judgment of each individual.

Before I conclude this subject, I may be allowed to ask, how the clergyman will prove that the doctrine of the Catholic is more indulgent to the sin-

* When these expressions *peccatorum indulgentia* or *remissio* occur in grants of indulgences, they are perfectly understood by Catholics, though not in the sense of the Durham clergyman. As an indispensable condition, it is required that the sinner shall have previously performed whatever the Catholic church considers necessary for the remission of sin ; and then only she grants him a remission of the canonical penance, or temporal punishment, to which he ought to be subjected. Hence it is evident that an indulgence cannot be a pardon for sin, since the sin is supposed to have been already pardoned. As to the ingenious comment on attrition in page 37, it is founded on a mistake. No Catholic divine ever taught that the sinner could be reconciled to God without a firm resolution of amendment ; neither did the council assert that attrition *sufficed*, but that it *disposed* the sinner to obtain the remission of his offences. Sess. 14, c. 4.

ner than the doctrine of the Protestant church. According to the latter, as far as I can learn, all that is required for the remission of sin, is a hearty sorrow for the offence, and a fixed determination to amend. Now all this the popes require in their bulls, and besides this, confession and the performance of some good work. Our indulgences considered in this light, cannot be more subversive of morality than the practices of the established church. If the purity of our doctrine has sometimes been polluted by the vices of those who maintained it, it ought not to be matter of surprise. Avarice could infect one of the apostles of Jesus: can we wonder if, at different periods, it infected some of their successors? It could even creep into the church of England, a society small in comparison, and but recently established to put down the errors and corruptions of popery: can we wonder, if it has sometimes found its way into a body infinitely more numerous, and which has subsisted through a long succession of ages? Catholics have lamented these abuses as much as Protestants can do: and if my opponent will consult the acts of the councils during the two centuries preceding the reformation, he will find in them canons as severe and apposite, as any which, for a similar purpose, have been enacted by the present church of England. Should it then be asked, why these abuses were not abolished before the council of Trent, the clergyman cannot be at a loss for an answer. He must be well aware of the

common defect of all religious establishments.
 “ When abuses have once crept into them, which
 “ will ever attend every government and every in-
 “ stitution administered by men, the want of that
 “ quick discernment of faults, which is oftener
 “ found in enemies than in friends, prevents many
 “ disorders from being rectified, many abuses
 “ from being reformed, and many spirited, yet
 “ salutary, measures from being carried into exe-
 “ cution.”* This truth has been fully exempli-
 fied in the reformed church of England.

* See an elegant and instructive tract, *An enquiry into the moral and political tendency of the religion called Roman Catholic*, printed for Robinsons and Faulder, 1790, p. 27. As the Remarker is indebted to the Durham clergyman for an indulgence published by Gregory VIII. I hope he will accept in return one or two Protestant indulgences. The first was published by the pious Luther, and contains a perpetual indulgence for the commission of adultery in certain circumstances. That it may be concealed from the eye of the profane, I shall transcribe it in the original language. “ Ut non est in meis viribus situm, ut vir
 “ non sim, tam non est etiam mei juris, ut absque muliere sim.
 “ Rursum ut in tua manu non est, ut femina non sis, sic nec in
 “ te est, ut absque viro degas Tertia ratio divortii est,
 “ ubi alter alteri se subduxerit, ut debitam benevolentiam persol-
 “ vere nolit, aut habitare cum eo renuerit.—Hic opportunum est
 “ ut maritus dicat: *Si tu nolueris, altera volet: Si domina nolit*
 “ *adveniat ancilla.*” Oper. Luth. Ed. Wirt. tom. v. fol. 119
 123. The second was an indulgence granted by Luther and seven other divines, to Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, to have two wives at the same time. For the edification of the public I shall extract a few passages, and translate them into English. The bull itself may be seen in the original Latin, in Bossuet’s Variations, l. vi. In his declaration to Luther and Melancthon, the Landgrave had

On the celebration of the liturgy in an unknown tongue, the clergyman is content with referring his adversary to 1 Cor. xiv. which he considers as a positive condemnation of the Catholic practice. I have read the whole chapter with great attention, and the consequence is a conviction in my mind, that our intellects have been cast in two very dif-

informed them, that he had never loved his wife, that he had not been faithful to her more than three weeks, and that he could not abandon the dissolute state of life in which he lived. For these reasons he begs a dispensation to have two wives. In their answer, after some preliminary observations, they proceed thus:—
 “ But if your highness do not abstain from an impure life, because
 “ you say it is impossible for you to do so, we should wish that
 “ your highness were in a better state before God. . . . But if
 “ your highness be fully resolved to take another wife, we judge
 “ that it ought to be done secretly, as we have said above with
 “ respect to the dispensation; that is to say, that none but the
 “ lady herself, and a few trusty persons obliged to secrecy under
 “ the seal of confession, know any thing of the matter. Hence
 “ it will not be attended with any important contradiction or
 “ scandal. For it is not unusual for princes to keep mistresses;
 “ and though the vulgar should be scandalized, the more prudent
 “ would understand this moderate method of life, and would prefer it to adultery, or other brutal and foul actions. There is no
 “ need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided
 “ all go right with conscience. Your highness hath therefore not only the approbation of us all, in a case of necessity,
 “ but also the considerations which we have made thereupon. . .
 “ We are most ready to serve your highness. Dated at Wittemberg, the Wednesday after the feast of St Nicholas, 1539.

“ MARTIN LUTHER,	ADAM,
“ PHILIP MELANCTHON,	JOHN LENINGUE.
“ MARTIN BUCER,	JUSTICE WINTFERTE,
“ ANTHONY CORVIN,	DIONYSIUS MELANTHER.”

ferent moulds. Of that which he sees so clearly, I have been unable to discover the faintest trace. I do not observe that the apostle ever mentions the liturgy, or so much as refers to it : all his animadversions seem to be directed against the vanity or insubordination of the converts, who were eager to display, in the assembly of the faithful, the graces which they had received, and, by their extemporary discourses, frequently disturbed the harmony of the service. Still the apostle indulges them in the use of unknown tongues, but under certain limitations, to prevent disedification and scandal ; and I hope that those who so forcibly urge against Catholics the obligation of complying with the command of St Paul, will not refuse to give us the example by following it themselves. We will suppose, for a moment, that my reverend adversary has assented to this proposition ; then the service in his church will be arranged in the following very edifying manner.

As soon as the clergyman shall have read the liturgy according to the book of common prayer, one of his parishioners (whether clerk or layman is no matter) will rise, and, in a most impressive manner, harangue the audience in some foreign language, perhaps in High Dutch. The moment he is silent, a second preacher will succeed in Arabic ; and he will be followed by a third in Chinese. After the orators, the apostle commands the interpreter to explain ; and the clergyman must take this difficult office on himself, un-

less he chance to be assisted by the learned Messrs Faber and Granville Sharpe, the enlightened expositors of the book of Revelations. Prophesying will close the service; and every man who can persuade himself that he feels the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, will claim a right to groan out the yearnings of his spirit into the ears of his brethren. In this place, however, I am sorry to inform the ladies, that, though the female tongue appears to be far better adapted to the office of prophesying than that of the other sex, yet the apostle is positive in his prohibition. They must be content to sit in silence, and listen with deference to the lectures of the male prophets.* This is a picture of the system of divine service, which the imprudence of the converts compelled the apostle to sanction with his approbation. But it is evident that both his approbation and censure were confined to a temporary object; and that, at the cessation of miraculous gifts, they became a dead letter, the mere testimony of disorders which once had existed, and were never likely to be revived.

Sometimes, when I have amused myself with

* If any speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two or at most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret. Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the others judge. If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace. For ye may all prophesy one by one. Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak. 1 Cor. xiv. 27, 29, 30, 31, 34.

looking into the book of common prayer, I have found it difficult to persuade myself that I was not reading an unknown tongue. I will instance a passage or two for the instruction and edification of my readers. “ Let them not see the sun. Or
 “ ever your pots be made hot with thorns ; so let
 “ indignation vex him even as a thing that is raw.*
 “ Judah is my lawgiver. Moab is my wash-pot.
 “ Over Edom will I cast my shoe. Philistia, be
 “ thou glad of me.† Though ye have lien among
 “ the pots, yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove ;
 “ that is, covered with silver wings, and her feathers like gold. And the hill of Basan, so is
 “ God’s hill ; even an high hill, as the hill of Basan. Why hop ye so high, ye high hills?”†
 Nor is this unknown tongue confined to the book of common prayer : it is extended even to the book of homilies, that model of pastoral eloquence, which the Church of England proposes to her clergy. What female of the present day could understand the following elegant apostrophe?—
 “ O thou woman, not a christian, but worse than
 “ a panim, thou minister of the devil, why pampereest thou that carrion flesh so high, which
 “ sometimes doth stink on the earth as thou
 “ goest? Howsoever thou perfumest thyself, thy
 “ beastliness cannot be hidden, or overcome with
 “ thy smells and savours : but, perchance, some
 “ dainty dame will say, and answer me,” &c.

* 11th day, morning prayer. † Same day, evening prayer.

† 13th day, morning prayer.

On the Vulgate translation of the scriptures, the clergyman has been sparing of his comments: I shall beg leave to be more diffuse. It is a subject, respecting which much misrepresentation was formerly circulated, and which has been treated with no small degree of prejudice by some modern controversialists.*

* Here I may be allowed to observe, that the blast of the ecclesiastical trumpet has lately awakened from his slumbers a watchman of the holy city, the Rev. George Stephenson, M. A. vicar of Kelloe, curate of Bishopwearmouth, and formerly fellow of Magdalen College. In consequence of the Bishop's charge, this indefatigable divine has composed, preached and published twenty sermons, for the charitable purpose of exposing the abominations of the Church of Rome. His work does at least honour to the moral character of the inhabitants of Bishopwearmouth. It proves that, in the opinion of their pastor, during twenty weeks there was no need of proposing to their consideration any subject of piety or morality. At the same time, I fear, it is some reflection on their intellectual attainments. I do not conceive that the curate of Bishopwearmouth, had he believed his parishioners to be possessed of common sense, could have thought it necessary to warn them against seduction to a religion so absurd as that which he has delineated in his pages. I may also say, that I admire the taste of the man, who could delight in raking together so much filth out of the common sewers: his book is scarcely made up of any thing else. But my principal reason for calling the attention of the reader to this publication, was, to notice the manner in which he has treated the subject on which I am now engaged; and, unfortunately, he has treated all the rest in nearly the same manner.

*Accipe nunc Danaum insidias, et crimine ab uno
Disce omnes.*

f. Of all the ancient versions of the sacred writings, the Vulgate has obtained the highest degree of praise from the ablest biblical students, both Protestants and Catholics; and it possesses, in

He tells us, p. 325, that the Church of Rome has declared, "that the holy scriptures were not composed for the use of the multitude, but only of their spiritual teachers; and, under this pretext, has ordered them to be taken from the people," &c. I answer that the Church of Rome never did issue such a declaration. If I am wrong, let him produce it. "In Spain the Bible," he says, "is locked up from the laity: the use of it, in their own tongue, is forbidden, under the severest penalties." Yet in Spain it is permitted in their own tongue, and the Spaniards boast, that their translation is the most elegant of all those that have hitherto been made in any of the vulgar languages. He says, p. 329, that the English Romanists have a version, but are not permitted to read it without a licence. Let him ask the first Catholic he meets in Bishopwearmouth, and from him he may learn the contrary. The French Romanists, he continues, have no authorised translation in their language. I answer, that they have several, some of great antiquity, others of more modern date. They have a version by Des Moulins made in 1294, and one by De Presle in 1380, a third by Le Fevre printed in 1528, a fourth by the Louvain doctors in 1550, a fifth by Corbin in 1643, and a sixth by Sacy in 1672. There are also authorised translations in Germany and Italy, and, I have no doubt, in all other Catholic countries. Hence we may form some judgment of Mr Stephenson's attention to veracity, and wonder how any man could utter such falsehoods from the pulpit, and in the name of the God of truth,—or how he could conceive, that, by such misrepresentation, he was fulfilling his duty of announcing glory to God on high, and peace to men on earth. If the reader will take the trouble to compare Mr Des Mahis' work with its pretended refutation by Mr Stephenson, he will easily learn which of the two defends the better cause.

another respect, an invaluable advantage over all modern translations. It was adopted in the Latin church long before the birth of those controversies, which at present divide the children of the reformation from the communion of Rome. Its author or authors, therefore, cannot be accused of any bias or partiality, which might induce them to pervert the meaning of the passages connected with the subjects in debate.

2. Soon after the reformation, Europe was inundated with a flood of biblical translations, some of which were disgraced by the most corrupt doctrines, and glaring perversions of the meaning of the original. In these circumstances, it became necessary for the Catholic Church to fix on some particular version, and propose it for the instruction of her children. The judgment of the fathers of the council of Trent selected the Vulgate ; and it was decreed that in all public lectures, disputes, sermons, and interpretations, that version alone should be considered as *authentic*. The meaning of this word has been perverted by the ingenuity of our adversaries. By the council it was understood to denote, that, in all points of importance, the Vulgate contained the true word of God, so that it might be safely perused without any danger of error in faith and morals : and here I may observe, that by this decree the Catholic Church did no more than Luther and Calvin did by their respective translations, and the Church of England

does, at the present day, by her translation of the scriptures.

3. By declaring that, among the *versions* of that period, the Vulgate alone should be considered as authentic, the council did not mean to confer on it a superiority over the *originals*. Yet this is a calumny, which has given birth to much petulant invective against the spiritual tyranny of the Catholic church, and much insulting commiseration for the spiritual blindness of her disciples. Would those who use such language, spend a year in some Catholic university, they would learn with what application the originals are studied, with what freedom they are cited, and how often their authority is alledged against certain passages of the Vulgate in the public disputations. Before the decree of the council, the Catholics had published, and after it continued to publish, corrected and improved editions of the Greek and Hebrew scriptures.

4. Much less was it the intention of the council to decree, that the Vulgate was free from faults. It has frequently been emended by the orders of the Roman pontiffs, and many Catholic writers have exercised their abilities in discovering and publishing the nature of these errors. Is there nothing to correct in the authorised version of the present church of England?

5. Neither is it true that Catholics lock up the scriptures from the knowledge of the laity. Let our adversaries, if they can, produce for this as-

sertion, the decree of any council, the bull of any pope, the statute of any provincial synod, or the order of any bishop. They know that they cannot. Their only resource is the prohibition in the index. I must, however, observe, that the index has not the power of declaring articles of Catholic faith, or of forming canons of general discipline. Its authority was always very confined, and in many Catholic countries was never acknowledged. Yet this very prohibition contained in the index, is only conditional, and has always been considered as a temporary regulation. At a time, when every species of impiety was taught by fanaticism, and supported by texts from the vernacular versions of the scripture, Pius IV. thought it adviseable, that in every parish, the propriety or non-propriety of reading the sacred writings in the vulgar tongue, should be left to the discretion and judgment of the curate. Had this regulation been adopted in the Protestant churches, it would have spared the christian religion many an extravagance, at which she was compelled to blush. We should not then have heard of the famous John of Leyden, who, by interpreting the bible, made himself king of Munster, and introduced polygamy among his disciples; nor of David of Delft, who, besides the virtue last mentioned, taught another equally creditable, that of incest; nor of Hermannus, the cobbler of Optzant, who professed to be the son of God, drank in the spirit from a hogshhead of strong beer, and then exclaimed, “ Kill, cut the throats
 “ of all the monks and popes. Repent, repent;

“ for your deliverance is at hand.” We should not then have heard of William Simpson, “ who “ was moved of the Lord to go naked in markets, “ courts,” &c. nor of Nailor, who, freed from the incumbrances of dress, entered Bristol on horseback, while the inspired multitude shouted *Hosanna to the son of David*; nor of the London leather-seller, with the edifying name of *Praise-God Barebone*, and his still more saintly brother with the more impressive name of, *If Christ had not died for thee, thou hadst been damned, Barebone*. During this period of religious insanity, while the human mind was prepared for the reception of every extravagance, it was, perhaps, wisely done to prohibit the lecture of the scripture to those whom their pastors did not think incapable of such folly. What has the reformation obtained by the opposite conduct? It has divided Christendom into a thousand different sects, disseminated an indifference to all religious truth, and kept the poor in a state of the most distressing ignorance: and still, with these facts staring them in the face, men can come forward, and reproach the Catholic church with obstructing the diffusion of scripture knowledge; that church which, since the reformation, has been constantly employed in carrying the light of the gospel to infidel nations; which, before that period, subdued the ferocity of the barbarous tribes that dismembered the Roman empire; which led our pagan ancestors from the altars of Woden to those of the living God; and to which every people that has learned to bow the

knee to the divinity of Jesus, is indebted for the knowledge of that sacred name.

Thus have I patiently travelled through the pages of a pamphlet, which its own author has ingenuously pronounced to be dull and heavy. The tediousness of the road was not relieved by one object capable of awakening curiosity, or of arresting attention. I am glad we have done. The clergyman concludes his letter with an advice, to which the Remarker probably would answer in the words of an old proverb: *Physician, cure thyself*. At parting I may be allowed to add one observation: That at a time when every arm should be united to repel the common enemy, it is folly to disturb unanimity by disseminating religious discord. Of those who have thought proper to adopt such conduct, I may applaud the intentions, but I must condemn the bigotry. They may be friends to the church in their hearts: their pens are its most dangerous enemies.

REPLY
TO
THE REV. THOMAS LE MESURIER,
RECTOR OF NEWNTON LONGVILLE.

Alter rixatur de lanâ sæpe caprinâ,
Propugnat nugis armatus : scilicet ; ut non
Sit mihi primâ fides, et vere quod placet, ut non
Acriter elatrem, pretium ætas altera sordet.

WITH the preceding pages I had flattered myself that the controversy was closed : a recent publication has convinced me of my mistake.* From the county of Bucks, from his watch-tower of Newnton Longville, the Rev. Thomas Le Mesurier has sounded the alarm. His orthodoxy has been

* See a pamphlet with the multifarious title of "A reply to certain observations of the Right Reverend Dr Milner, including some notice of the transactions of 1791, and 1793 ; of Dr Troy's pastoral charge ; of the Pope's rescript ; of the Remarks upon the Bishop of Durham's charge ; of the acts of the council of Constance ; Mr Sydney Smith's sermon, and other matters." *Farra-go libelli !*

taught to tremble for the safety of the Established Church ; and an imperious duty has compelled him to warn his brethren against the delusive sophistry of a work, “ which, from its lively and entertaining stile, he fears is likely to become popular”* What pleasing tales the vanity of an author may have whispered in the ear of the rector of Newton Longville, is not for me to divine. His, undoubtedly, is a name well-known among the amateurs of the art of wrangling. He has measured weapons with the Edinburgh reviewers, and the Monthly reviewers ; with Dr Lawrence, Dr Milner, and Dr Troy ; and his numerous scars, the evidences of many a well-fought battle, bear an honourable testimony, if not to his success, at least to his courage. If then he be dissatisfied with the services of those, who have already undertaken the defence of the Bishop’s charge ;† if he think himself better qualified to meet the Remarker in the field of controversy, he has certainly a right to make the experiment. It will be for the church, in whose cause he professes to fight, to appreciate his merits, to reward his success, or to lament his temerity.

Mr Le Mesurier appears to have studied controversial tactics in the classic pages of Homer. Like the heroes of that poet, he does not rush in-

* Ibid, p. 208.

† See two publications entitled, a Protestant’s Reply, and a Letter to the author of the Remarks, by a clergyman of the diocese of Durham.

considerately to the conflict, but arrests his impetuosity to inquire into the parentage and character of his opponent. It will be uncourteous in me to refuse so small a satisfaction. Be it then known to him that the Remarker is no "false brother of the Established Church," even though he may display "a familiarity with Greek epigrams and Greek proverbs." Neither is he joined in communion with "the Socinian Aikin;" though it be his opinion, that of all the sects which have sprung from that prolific parent the reformation, the Socinians have the fairest claim to the name of Protestants.* Nor of the Edinburgh and Monthly reviewers does he know much more, than that they have often taught him to laugh at the expense of the Rector of Newton Longville. The Remarker is a Catholic, not one, "whose religious sentiments sit very loose upon him," but a Catholic from conviction, who, though he has never taken the oath or creed of

* If Mr Le Mesurier will honour the last page of the Remarks with a second perusal, he will learn that its author had directed his attack, not against the doctrine of the Trinity as taught by the Established Church, but against the doctrine of the Bishop respecting the practices of the Catholics. In p. 173, he also accuses the Remarker of ridiculing the doctrine of the Trinity, because Gregory XIII. had excommunicated the *Trinitarii*. But to be a polemic it is not necessary to be acquainted with ecclesiastical history: otherwise Mr Le Mesurier must have known that the persons, who in that age were called *Trinitarii*, were those who rejected, not those who admitted, the doctrine of the Trinity.

Pius IV. believes all the religious tenets of his church with as much sincerity, to say the least, as Mr Le Mesurier does the thirty-nine articles to which he has subscribed ; and who esteems it his pride and happiness to belong, not to any modern sect, but to that great society of christians, which derives its descent in a direct and uninterrupted succession from the apostles. With this explanation, I trust he will be satisfied.

The subject which Mr Le Mesurier has selected for the first trial of his strength with the author of the Remarks, is an accusation which the Bishop has frequently brought against the Church of Rome ; that by its corruptions it had been the parent of French infidelity, and of course was chargeable with all the horrors of the French revolution. To this indictment the Remarker, in the name of his church, pleaded not guilty. From the speculations of the Bishop he appealed to the evidence of history. He moved for a writ to enquire who was the true parent of the child. He contended that, in reality, modern atheism was the offspring, not of popery, but of Protestantism : that the French were only the scholars of the English infidels : and that these were indebted for their superior illumination to the intrepidity with which they had pushed, to their full extent, the fundamental principles of the reformation.* To

* In the very outset Mr Le Mesurier gives a very favourable specimen of his abilities as an advocate. The Bishop had assign-

a genealogy so well corroborated by dates and facts, Mr Le Mesurier found himself compelled to yield a faint and reluctant assent; but for the concession he has amply consoled himself by the discovery of an argument, which he trusts will still prove the Bishop's accusation to be perfectly correct. He tells us, that in England the writings of the infidels made no impression on the great body of the inhabitants; because the common people, having the word of God before their eyes, were not to be talked out of their religion. They only became mischievous, when they were translated into the languages of the countries in which the people were debarred all access to the truths of the gospel, and their minds revolted at the superstition and frauds of the Romish priests.* Here again we have speculation: let us try its accuracy by the most faithful of tests, its

ed as one of his reasons for ascribing infidelity to popery, that it was liable to the objections of thinking men: and the Remarker very naturally expressed his surprise that these thinking men did not, after discovering the errors of popery, discover also the truths of protestantism. Why did they prefer atheism to it? Oh! says Mr Le Mesurier, thinking does not always imply *thinking right* (p. 196). Be it so. It will only follow that, in the Bishop's opinion, the thinking men, who have objections to popery, are those who do not *think right*. Pray! how did the Bishop *think*, when he objected to popery, that it was derogatory from the honour of God the Father, the mediatorship of God the Son, and the sanctifying influence of God the Holy Ghost? Is he also to be excluded from the number of thinking men, who think right?

* Le Mesur. p. 197.

agreement with facts. In comparing the common people in England with the common people in France, does Mr Le Mesurier take the latter as they were before, or as they were during, the revolution? In the first supposition, he has assumed that which it will be incumbent on him to prove. I have no hesitation to assert that, before the revolution, the writings of the infidels had made but little impression on the mass of the common people in France. Their attachment to all the practices of their religion was equal, or rather it was far superior, to that which is manifested at the present day by the same class in England. Whoever has witnessed the crowds, which filled on a Sunday the parish churches in France, and the scanty attendance which is generally given to them in this country, will acknowledge the truth of my assertion. The religion of the great body of the French people might be termed enthusiasm, in opposition to the indifference, the cold neglect, of the common people in this kingdom.

If, on the other hand, Mr Le Mesurier meant to compare the religious conduct of the English, at the present day, with that of the French during the revolution, the comparison was unfair. You must place each in a similar situation, before you can legitimately draw the inference. During the paroxysm of revolutionary phrenzy, it was not surprising if the infidels, who had assumed the powers of government, were able, under the influence of terror, and the seduction of liberty, to persecute

the ministers, and suspend for a time the exercise of religion. For this temporary desertion of their creed, the great body of the people atoned by the alacrity with which they returned to the Catholic worship, at the first dawn of internal tranquillity. Their subsequent conduct has shewn that the doctrines of infidelity had never taken root in their hearts. If, for the sake of argument, England instead of France had been the theatre of the revolution, and the English clergy had displayed that determined opposition to the views of the demagogues, which distinguished the French clergy, does not Mr Le Mesurier believe, that the established church also would have fallen, its dignities have been abolished, and its wealth confiscated? Yet could he justly have ascribed such a catastrophe to the infidelity of the common people?

But, he will ask, were not the people in France “debarred all access to the truths of the gospel, “and were not their minds revolted at the superstitions and frauds of the Romish priests?” The first part of the interrogation alludes, I conceive, to the well-known objection respecting the scriptures in a vulgar tongue, which has been already noticed in several parts of this controversy. Here I shall only add, that in most, perhaps in all, the dioceses in France, the more advanced among the children were obliged, on every Sunday and many holidays, to repeat by heart in the parish church, the epistle and gospel for the day: a singular method of “debarring them all access to the truths

“ of the gospel !” As to the frauds of the Romish priests, I can only pity the prejudice or the ignorance of the man who has brought the objection. A Romish priest is no longer an unknown character in this island. There was a time, when Protestant liberality was allowed to paint him in the most hideous colours: and I have known many an orthodox churchman stare at a Catholic clergyman, as if he were an ourang outang, or an infernal being in a human shape. But these days have passed away. Hundreds of Romish priests, and those too from the very country to which Mr Le Mesurier alludes, have lately dwelt among us. Their moral and religious conduct has been open to the eyes of every beholder: and I am convinced that no one, who cultivated their acquaintance, will be ashamed to assert, that they were as sincere in their belief, and as incapable of fraud, as the Rector of Newnton Longville or his brethren.

Were I to follow Mr Le Mesurier step by step, through the remaining pages of his pamphlet, I should only weary both myself and the reader. Of his arguments, many have been already noticed in the course of this controversy; and those who wish for more information on such subjects, may consult the theologians, who have professedly discussed the opposite claims of the two churches. My object will only be to offer a few observations on certain passages, which strike me as peculiarly novel, or peculiarly interesting.

In page 201, Mr Le Mesurier has amused himself with drawing a long and tedious parallel between the real or supposed doctrines of the churches of Rome and England respecting the remission of sin. Now, reader, what think you is the object of this parallel? A singular one indeed it is: no other than to determine, which of the two holds out to her children the greatest encouragement for the perpetration of crimes. The claim of superiority, as was to be expected, he awards to the Church of Rome: but, before I state the reasons on which he grounds his decision, I may be allowed to observe, that, if the Catholic doctrine invites to sin, the conduct of Catholics exhibits a moral phenomenon, highly deserving of investigation. We are made, I presume, of the same materials as our protestant neighbours; our breasts feel the influence of the same passions; our virtue is exposed to the same temptations. Thus far our circumstances are similar: but then comes the great discriminating difference. It is the happiness of the Protestant to practise a pure, unadulterated worship, which unfolds to his eye the moral truths of the scriptures, opposes a strong barrier to the impulse of the passions, and checks the diffusion of vice: while it is the misfortune of the Catholic to profess a religion, which studiously conceals the scriptures from the eyes of the people, encourages sin, and urges to the gratification of illicit desires. Now, if these premises be true, what other conclusion

can be drawn from them, than that of all classes of christians, the Catholics must be the most depraved. But is such reasoning justified by experience? I call on the Rector of Newnton Longville to make the enquiry. Let him compare the morals of the nearest Catholic congregation with the morals of his own Protestant parishioners, of those who have had the happiness to receive from his own lips the saving truths of the gospel, and then let him say whether the Catholics yield to them in piety or virtue. If they do not, as I trust they do not, let him endeavour to reconcile this fact with his opinion respecting the immoral tendency of their creed. A similar invitation I have already made to two of the Remarker's opponents. They have had the prudence to decline it. We shall soon learn if Mr Le Mesurier be more adventurous.

Knowing, as from my profession I must know, the true nature of the Catholic worship, and convinced, as from long experience I am, that it is hostile to the existence of vice in any of its shapes, it was with much surprise that I first read Mr Le Mesurier's extraordinary assertion. I was anxious to learn on what foundation it rested; and was informed, that according to the Catholic doctrine, "be you as great a sinner as you please, the church has power to absolve you, if you will but submit to the penance which she may impose." Were even such our doctrine, I might still doubt whether the inference were legitimate:

but I must be allowed to ask Mr Le Mesurier, from what profession of Catholic faith he drew his information? Had the assertion been only sported in one of those ephemeral sermons, which the charity of some Protestant clergyman prompts them occasionally to preach against us, it might have passed unnoticed. From his pulpit, the Rector of Newnton Longville may pour the stream of his eloquence without the risk of contradiction. There, probably, he will be opposed by no sceptic who may doubt, no critic who may refute his accusations. With gaping mouths the pious flock will devour his words, and bless the orthodox shepherd who feeds their souls with such delectable manna. But to hazard a charge, so devoid of foundation, and so easy of detection, in a publication open to the perusal both of friends and foes, is a dangerous experiment. The victims of calumny will not be slow to assert their innocence; and the man who values his character as a minister of the God of truth, should be careful how he disgrace it with the imputation of forgery. Far be it from me to impute to Mr Le Mesurier any intentional misrepresentation; but I may be permitted to lament, that neither the experience of age, nor the advantages of an academical education have been able to eradicate from his mind the prejudices of the nursery:

The priest continues what the nurse began,
And thus the child imposes on the man:

The truth is, the doctrine so confidently ascribed to us is not only not our doctrine, but the very opposite to it. We do not teach, that the church has power to absolve the sinner as often as he pleases, provided he submit to the penance enjoined him ; but we do teach, that no penance whatever, though even united with absolution, will suffice for the remission of one grievous sin, without contrition : that is, without a true sorrow for the offence committed against God, a firm resolution of amendment, and a disposition of mind to repair, as circumstances will permit, every injury offered to our neighbour. These are considered as conditions indispensably necessary for the forgiveness of sin. Without them we are taught that no penance, no absolution, can be of any avail. And will Mr Le Mesurier undertake to prove that such a doctrine is an encouragement to sin ?*

* To a Catholic reader nothing can appear more extraordinary than the confidence with which Mr Le Mesurier decides what is and what is not our belief, and the profound ignorance, which on such occasions he invariably betrays. Of the numerous instances of this assertion, with which his answer to these pages abounds, I shall be content to notice one. The doctrine delivered above is familiar to every Catholic from his childhood, and is contained in every book of Catholic instruction which I ever saw. Yet Mr Le Mesurier is confident it is not our doctrine : he terms my assertion bold and unwarranted : he defies me to produce any authority in its support. (Supplement to reply, p. 5.) The following authority is sufficiently long for a note, and sufficiently explicit to satisfy an unprejudiced mind. It is taken from a book of prayers composed by a Catholic prelate, and published for the use

2. But the Rector of Newnton Longville is not so easily satisfied. He tells us, that the Catholic church “ grants indulgences prospectively for sins “ to come ;* and chastises the insincerity of the Remarker, who had preserved the most obstinate silence on that head. It is no difficult task to vindicate the Remarker. He knew that indulgences for sins to come are only ideal beings, that exist no where but in the writings of our adversaries : that they are no more than spectres, conjured up by religious bigotry, to frighten the imagination of the vulgar ; or rather, that they are, to use the words of the late Mr Fox on a similar subject, no better than “ good, sound, Protestant lies.” But will it be so easy to vindicate the conduct of Mr Le Mesurier ? How will he apologize for his adoption of this antiquated forgery ? Will he say

of the Catholics serving in the army and navy. “ You know “ from the catechisms you have learned, and the books of Catholic instruction you have read, that the absolution of a priest can “ be of no service to you, unless you be duly disposed to a reconciliation with your offended God, by true faith, by a sincere sorrow for all your sins, by a firm resolution never to commit them “ again, and by a willingness to satisfy God, and your neighbour “ also, as far as justice requires. Without these dispositions on your “ part, the act of the priest would not be ratified in heaven ; you “ would be guilty of a profanation of the sacrament of penance, “ and provoke the indignation of the Almighty instead of obtaining his mercy. It is only when he sees you thus duly disposed, “ that God looses in heaven, what, by his authority, and according “ to the conditions of his institution, his minister looses on earth.”

* Le Mesur. p. 202.

that he had not sufficiently examined the subject, or that he retailed the calumny on the authority of others? If so, let me advise him to add the following maxim to his collection of controversial canons, that “ it is a breach of common honesty, “ either to advance an accusation against any man, “ or body of men, without having examined into “ its truth, or to repeat it, when it has been “ proved to be false, and without foundation.”*

3. Mr Le Mesurier has a third and still more powerful argument in reserve. He hopes to silence his adversary by the testimony of a book, which has long been the pride of the bigot and the polemic; has often reddened with shame the cheek of the most obdurate papist; and, what is of still more utility to mankind, has furnished the learned, pious, and visionary Mr Granville Sharp with a key to unlock to astonished mortals the secrets contained in the book of Revelations.† This book, so pregnant with important consequences, is the *Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ*, or a tariff of the prices at which sins may be redeemed in the Roman chancery, the great custom house of human guilt. If the reader will be at the trouble to peruse the different articles of this valuable code, he will at least acknowledge, that the pope is extremely moderate in his demands, and wonder, that his holiness has not employed a

* Aikin, Annual Review for 1806, p. 595.

† See Observations, &c. at the end.

British financier to improve the receipts of his treasury. In England, you cannot obtain a licence to keep a setting dog, without paying a tax of ten shillings: at Rome, it seems, a man may murder his father, and enjoy the estate, for the payment of the same duty. Here, one and twenty shillings are demanded for permission to powder your hair once in twelve months: there, for an equal sum, you may keep a mistress, without endangering your salvation. However, should Mr Le Mesurier, or his friend, stray as far as Rome, I would not have them rely with too much confidence on the *Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ*; they might find themselves in the same unpleasant situation as the Roman nobleman, mentioned by O'Leary, who, when he was accused of having three wives living at the same time, attempted to justify his conduct by observing, that he had not been able to meet with one with whom he could be happy. "Since it is so difficult," replied the pontiff, Sixtus Quintus, "to please you in this world, you shall go and try your fortune in the other. There, women are more numerous, and you may find one to your liking." The *Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ* could not save him. He was tried for polygamy, and executed.

The Roman chancery is a very ancient establishment, the regulations of which were originally formed by John XXII, and brought into their present form by Nicholas V. At the death of each pope these regulations are supposed to expire: but

his successor is always careful to revive them ; and thus they remain, at the present day, substantially the same as they were some centuries ago. From them, the *Regulæ Cancellariæ Romanæ*, it appears that the causes brought before that tribunal, regard the temporalities of vacant bishoprics ; the collation, permutation, or resignation of benefices ; absolution from canonical censures ; and dispensations from the canonical impediments of marriage. With the guilt of sin the Roman chancery has no concern whatever. All its absolutions are stiled in *foro externo* : they regard only the punishments inflicted by the canons ; and of course all the reasonings and accusations, the pious invectives, and indignant exclamations, to which the contrary supposition has given birth, are the offspring of error or fiction. It is indeed true, that, for the transaction of business in the papal chancery, as well as in the ecclesiastical courts in England, fees have been required by the officers ; but these are not paid as the price of sin, but for the expedition of business. This circumstance, however, furnished a useful hint to some of the fathers of the reformation, who had no objection to a pious fraud, when it might promote the godly work in which they were engaged. The *Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ* were ingeniously corrected, interpolated, and enlarged : the improved copy was circulated by the reformers as a proof that Rome was the great custom-house of sin ;

and the cheat was greedily devoured by the prejudices of their disciples.* That during a period of religious ferment it should have obtained credit in England, cannot excite surprise : but I had thought that in the present enlightened age it had been consigned to the contempt which it deserves. Even from Guthrie's geography, in which it retained an honourable place during so many editions, it has recently been expunged by the liberality of the publishers ; and I am happy to observe, that

* The principal Protestant editions of the *Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ* are those given by Pinet and Banck, and both were censured as spurious at Rome and Madrid, and one of them by the archbishop of Paris. Bayle (and, I believe, it is to Bayle, either mediately or immediately, that most of our adversaries are indebted for the knowledge which they display on this important subject) observes, that it is difficult to explain the great differences between these two editions, and to understand the real value of the monies which they mention. He adds, that there are also several editions given by Catholics at Paris and Cologne : but he, it appears, was never able to meet with any one copy of them. I have been equally unfortunate. I have, however, read the *Regulæ Cancellariæ*, printed in 1484, and several other editions from that period to the close of the last century, and in none of them have I met with a single word respecting absolution from sin. I have also examined the fees which are really permitted to be taken by the officers of that court, and find that none of them regard any other absolutions than those from canonical censures. They are demanded as a remuneration for trouble. (*Quæ solvuntur pro litterarum expeditionibus, communiter dicuntur Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicæ*, Van Espen, p. 248.) I should conceive that, whatever may be the opinion of Mr Le Mesurier, those who have had to pay these fees, have seldom thought that they were inducements to sin. Probably they would adopt the opposite opinion.

its present existence entirely depends on the credit of the firm of Messrs Le Mesurier, Granville Sharpe, & Co.

It may not, perhaps, be thought impertinent to the present subject, to adduce one instance of the manner, in which the powers intrusted to the Roman chancery, have been exercised in England since its separation from the apostolic see. In the year 1621, Dr George Abbot, the archbishop of Canterbury, was invited by the Lord Zouch to hunt in his park of Bramzil, in Hampshire. The most reverend primate might be a learned theologian :* he soon proved that he was an indifferent marksman. With a cross-bow he took his aim at a deer, and shot the keeper of the park, Peter Hawkins, who, within the space of an hour, died of the wound. The unfortunate accident threw the whole Church of England into confusion. Many thought that, by the homicide, the archbishop had incurred the canonical punishment of irregularity; and these contended that it was his duty to resign a dignity, the functions of which he was no longer able to discharge. But to the primate himself, this doctrine seemed to savour of popery: he boldly undertook to refute their opinion, and was strenuously supported by two

* Lord Clarendon observes, that " he was a man of very morose manners and sour aspect, totally ignorant of the true constitution of the Church of England; considering the christian religion no otherwise than as it abhorred and reviled popery; and valuing those men most that did it most furiously."

powerful advocates, Sir Henry Martin, and the bishop of Winchester. They maintained, that the accident could not be ascribed either to the negligence or the unskilfulness of the archbishop, but was owing entirely to the imprudence of the unfortunate man, who blindly ran into the way of the arrow: that by the charter of forests, the English prelates were allowed the pleasures of the chase: and that the hunting forbidden by the canons was, not like that of Dr Abbot, modest, decent and peaceable, but clamorous and public. These contradictory arguments perplexed even the theological discernment of king James: and to relieve his own doubts, he appointed a commission of bishops, judges, and lawyers, to examine the case of the primate, and to repeat to him their opinion. They met, consulted, and disagreed. After much deliberation their answer was, that the archbishop should be absolved conditionally, *ad majorem cautelam*. But here an unexpected difficulty arose. Who but the king, the supreme head of the church, could pretend to exercise any spiritual authority over the primate of all England? And yet, who had ever heard of a layman pretending to absolve an ecclesiastic from canonical censures? To extricate themselves from this dilemma, they petitioned the king to depute a certain number of clergymen, who might pronounce the sentence of absolution in his name: conceiving, I imagine, that the authority of a layman might derive something of a spiritual cha-

racter by passing through the mouth of an ecclesiastic. James granted their prayer : a royal commission was directed to eight bishops ; and these prelates, according to their instructions, absolved the archbishop from all canonical censures and irregularities which he might have incurred, restored his character, and permitted him to enter again on the exercise of his archiepiscopal functions. Their sentence received the king's confirmation, and passed the seals about six months after the death of Peter Hawkins.*

What sum of money this royal bull of absolution may have cost the primate, I am unable to determine : but that it was not engrossed, signed, and sealed, without the payment of the accustomed fees, will not be doubted by any one acquainted with the practices of our courts. Now were a Catholic writer to take advantage of this circumstance, and to contend that the king, as supreme head of the church, was accustomed to absolve from the guilt of murder for a small sum of money, were he to describe England as the great custom-house of crimes, were he to exclaim with the pathetic vehemence of Mr Granville Sharp, " Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins ;" would he not deserve the appellation of a mad-man or a slanderer ? If so, will the

* Wilkins, Conc. Mag. Brit. tom. iv. p. 462. Collier, Church Hist. tom. ii. p. 720. Le Neve, Lives, &c. of Protestant Bishops, vol. i. p. 98.

Rector of Newnton Longville tell us what name to give to the Protestant writer, who, on similar and no better grounds, prefers the same accusations against the church of Rome? *All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.*

In page 203, Mr Le Mesurier proceeds to lament, with the feelings of true orthodox charity, the deplorable thralldom in which our intellects are detained by the despotism of the church of Rome. “No layman, and not even a priest, is “allowed to read the scriptures in the language of “his country, still less any book of controversy, “not this note of mine, without a licence from “his bishop.” Bravo, Mr Le Mesurier! It is certainly a proud superiority this, which the freeman of the reformation is supposed to possess over the slave of popery. While the latter is condemned to view the promised land from a distance, the former may wander at pleasure from the book of Genesis to the book of Revelations, may ascend the tower of Babel, measure with Ezechiel the dimensions of the second temple, and witness the destruction of the scarlet w—— of Babylon. Through the sacred volumes he may trace the numerous errors of the human intellect, and successfully pore over the different texts, on which every new system of religion has been founded, from the days of the arch-reformer Simon Magus, to his last descendant, Joanna Southgate, the female prophet, who now vends the knowledge of

futurity in London. Let him, however, exercise his privilege with moderation ; let him be cautious how he plucks the flower which invites him.

Urticæ proxima sæpe rosâ est.

Should our evangelical Caräite unfortunately discover in the inspired writings, any doctrines which accord not with the standard of established orthodoxy, adieu to the liberty of the children of God. He must submit his judgment to the infallible decisions of his church, or he must forfeit, what many men will prefer to the exercise of their judgment, the civil rights to which, as an Englishman, he is entitled by his birth. So erroneous was that saying of our Redeemer, *my kingdom is not of this world*.

Let not Mr Le Mesurier, however, suppose that I shall grant the truth of his assertion. It is one of the many mistakes into which those frequently fall, who study books instead of facts ; and judge of the present practices of Catholics from the bold assertions of prejudiced controvertists, who lived a century ago. In defiance of his prohibition, the catholics, both laymen and ecclesiastics, do read, and will continue to read, the sacred volumes even in their native tongue. But how, perhaps it may be asked, are we then to account for the contrary assertion so frequently and so confidently made by our adversaries ? I conceive it must be an Oxfordism, a theological

axiom, which is taken for granted, to spare the labour of enquiry. To doubt its truth would mar many a controversial sermon, and deprive the preacher of an eloquent triumph over the superstitions of popery. But were Mr Le Mesurier to enquire of his next catholic neighbour, he would learn that this axiom is, like many other axioms, admitted only because its truth has not been examined.

To his observation respecting the prohibition of books of controversy, the same answer may suffice. I am, however, happy in being able to relieve his anxiety respecting his own works. The church of Rome is not so impolitic as to forbid the perusal of writings which are so favourable to her cause. If ever she condescend to notice the controversial lucubrations of the rector of Newnton Longville, it will be to recommend them to the perusal of her children. For Catholics, when they observe one of their most eager opponents directing his fiercest attacks against imaginary articles of their creed, will naturally infer, that if he has spared their real principles, it has been because he felt himself unable to refute them. The power might, the will could not be wanting.

It cannot have escaped the notice of the attentive reader, how frequently, since the very commencement of this controversy, doctrines have been ascribed to us, which we most emphatically disclaim. Had not the history of mankind explained the baneful influence of the odium theologicum,

how rapidly it obscures the understanding, and palsies all the more generous feelings, it might have been expected that our reverend and right reverend opponents, men, who from their education and their rank in life should be, and on other occasions are, liberal, dispassionate, and enlightened, would take the trouble to study our religious belief, before they attempt to refute it. Yet so it happens, that they generally chuse to frame for us such a creed as they think proper, and then insist on our admitting it as our own, whether we be willing or not. How far this may be reconcilable with theological sincerity, I shall not determine: it is certainly an ingenious and politic device. It establishes a kind of barter, without any reciprocity of risk. The profit is all theirs: the loss must fall upon us. They take from us our civil rights, and in return give us erroneous articles of faith. All the emoluments, all the honours in the state, they confine to themselves: and then very charitably bid us to console ourselves with the belief of the absurd and impious doctrines, which they have so liberally bestowed on us.

When we claim the faculty of knowing what it is we believe, we certainly ask but little. Yet this little is refused us. Our opponents arrogate to themselves a privilege which no pontiff ever dared to claim, even in the proudest days of the papal power. The successors of St Peter might decide what each Catholic *was bound* to believe: these new inquisitors decide what each Catholic ac-

tually *does* and *shall* believe. The pontiff might define, but he could not compel the assent of the understanding: these men define, and will not allow us even the power of dissent. Their infallibility extends over all our faculties, both physical and moral. The papist must necessarily be whatever they may please to represent him. To disclaim the false and odious tenets which they have added to our creed, is an idle, hopeless task. They laugh at our protestations, and condemn us of insincerity. Among the graces of their ordination, they appear to have received the peculiar privilege of penetrating into our breasts, of discovering our most secret sentiments, of analyzing and exposing the hidden motives of our conduct. To every argument which we adduce, they haughtily and tauntingly reply, that we are shifters and equivocators, and that, as it suits our convenience, we can disguise or disown each article of our creed.* Whence they have learned to form so unfavourable a notion of our character, I shall not inquire: but if it be well-founded, we must have been bunglers indeed, not to have escaped that load of penal restrictions, and legal disabilities, which their intolerance has heaped upon us. Were I disposed to retaliate, I would desire the Rector of Newnton Longville to look for instances of insincere-

* Le Mesurier's reply, p. 39, 42, 52, 197, &c. The Remarker has no reason to complain of such language, as he must share it with other writers more distinguished than himself.

rity, shuffling, and equivocation, not among the Catholic writers, but in another class of men, among whom, if report belie them not, there are those, who have been accustomed to make religion a matter of calculation, to weigh tithes against subscriptions, and to estimate the orthodoxy of a creed by the amount of its temporal emoluments. But peace to the errors and weaknesses of human nature, when they do not wound the feelings, nor trample on the rights of others. Were the doctrinal forgeries of our adversaries of this innoxious character, we should not complain. Their false notes might be permitted to circulate without interruption, for the edification of the illiterate, and the amusement of the learned. They might then call for unlimited credit: they might draw to any amount on the ignorance or the prejudices of the public. But when their only object is to stop the current of national justice and national liberality, to deprive of their civil rights millions of his majesty's subjects as loyal as themselves, and to degrade them beneath a level with the meanest of their Protestant countrymen, their misrepresentations become an evil of the most alarming tendency, and deserve the execration of every honest man.

In his last page, Mr Le Mesurier advises the Bishop of Durham to reprint some of the old tracts against popery. I am not surprised at it. He would be proud to appear in the company of his elder brethren, the controvertists of a former age,

Pares cum paribus, veteri proverbio, facillime congregantur. Unfortunately he was born a century too late. The books, which he so much admires, have long lain covered with dust on the shelves of our libraries: and there, it is probable, they will continue to lie

Like rusty mail in monumental mockery.

At the present day, Englishmen are, I trust, too wise to fight with each other for modes of faith. They would rather unite men of every religious persuasion to oppose the designs of a bold, powerful, and fortunate enemy, who, with all Europe at his beck, threatens our very existence as an independent nation. Let Mr Mesurier devote his abilities to this purpose, and he will deserve the gratitude of his country. As long as he continues to employ himself in collecting the superannuated follies of ancient polemics, and in republishing them to disturb the harmony, and consequently to divide the strength of the nation, his readers will be inclined to throw down his book, and to exclaim with the poet,

Hunc tu, Romane, caveto,

REPLY

TO

THE REV. G. S. FABER,

VICAR OF STOCKTON.

IT is truly edifying to observe the alacrity with which the clergy of the diocese of Durham continue to espouse the defence of the Bishop's charge. Formerly, that prelate thought it his duty to accuse them of lukewarmness and indifference:* now, at least, he must recal his censure, and applaud the zeal and promptitude of their exertions. To the other adversaries of the Remarker, has lately been added, a new, and more celebrated champion,—the Rev. G. S. Faber, B. D., and vicar of Stockton upon Tees. This gentleman is certainly at liberty to select, for the exercise of his abilities, any subjects which suit his judgment or inclination: but I think that the reputation which

* Charge, p. 21.

he has already acquired, cannot be improved by his interference in the petty squabbles excited by an episcopal charge. Prophecy, not controversy, is Mr Faber's peculiar department. In his progress through that region of mist and darkness, he has outstripped the speed of all his competitors. By his profound acquaintance with the helio-arkite mythology of the Cabiri, and the hieroglyphic language of the Apocalypse, he has already explained to the world the mysteries of the times past, of the time present, and of the time to come:* the success of his preceding exertions are an earnest of what we may expect in future; and his admirers will regret that a single moment of his time has been withdrawn from the pursuit of objects so interesting to the credulity of the pious and orthodox churchman.

It is, indeed, true that, in his pamphlet, the Remaker had named Mr Faber; but he had named him with respect. He had given him, what it had long been his object to acquire, the title of a prophet; and had assigned to him a task the most congenial to his studies, the explication of a mystery. He did not wish to entangle him in the webs of controversial sophistry, but to open to him a new field for the excursions of his fancy. He had invited him to explain the meaning of a

* See Mr Faber's great works, *The Mysteries of the Cabiri*, and *The Prophecies that have been fulfilled, are now fulfilling, or will hereafter be fulfilled, &c. &c.* 4 vols, octavo.

new mystery, which is not, indeed, to be found in the Cabirian mythology, or the canonical books of scripture, but which is frequently announced, with considerable energy, in the sermons and charges of the Bishop of Durham. We read, in the Apocalypse, of a woman in the heavens who brought forth a man-child, and then fled into the wilderness, where she was fed during the space of 1260 days, or [perhaps years: we read, in the works of the Right Rev. Prelate, of another woman who, though she became pregnant with infidelity at a very early period, did not bring forth her child till after a gestation of more than ten centuries. Mr Faber had very satisfactorily explained the mystery of the apocalyptic woman; and the Remarker had hoped that the mystery of the retarded parturition in the second woman, would have been as easily elucidated by his experience and ingenuity. He has, however, declined the task. He seems to think, with the Remarker, that a millennian period of gestation bears a very portentous aspect; and therefore willingly acquits popery of the imputation of being naturally pregnant with atheism.* He rather leans to the opinion of Andrew Fuller, “ who justly deems infidelity to be

* Mr Faber says, that the passage which he quoted from the charge, only asserted the revolutionary spirit to be, *in a great measure*, owing to the errors and defects of popery. In the passages to which the Remarker referred, the learned prelate seems to assert something more:

“ a putrid excrescence of the papal beast.”* With the works of “ this very able” genealogist, I have neither the means nor the inclination to be intimately acquainted ; but from the preceding specimen, I have no doubt that he was a writer of most correct taste, and most delicate feelings. Mr Faber’s own opinion, however, is, that “ infidelity may, *in some sense*, be called the abortive offspring of popery, because sceptical inquiry produced it, by acting on the corruptions of popery.”† Now, in almost every history of the reformation, I find the same origin assigned to Protestantism ; and, as I cannot believe Protestantism and infidelity to be the same thing, I must conclude that they are twin brothers, both “ the abortive offspring of popery.” Thus, then, whatever may become of the millennian gestation, it appears that, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, at the age of a thousand years, according to the imputation of her adversaries, the old lady unexpectedly found herself parent of two blooming boys, Protestantism and infidelity. Nor does the birth of this “ *par nobile fratrum*,” appear to have been unnoticed by the ancient prophets. Whether any allusion to it exist in the helio-arkite mythology, Mr Faber alone can tell us ; but it has certainly been predicted in the Apocalypse, by the two horns growing out of the head of the beast.

It is, however, “ *in some sense*” only, that Mr

* Faber, Answer to Bicheno, &c, p. 92. † Ibid.

Faber calls infidelity the offspring of popery. He therefore, proceeds to inform us, that the true parent is Socinianism. But whence did Socinianism derive its origin? It is on this point that the Vicar of Stockton joins issue with the Remarker; and while that writer describes the principles of Socinianism as a direct emanation from the principles of Protestantism, *he* contends that they come from a very different quarter, that they are the handywork of catholicity. For this very extraordinary assertion, he refers us to the authority of Mosheim; without reflecting, that the authority of Mosheim has very little weight with those who, from the tendency of the errors which abound in his work, have learned to esteem him rather as the advocate of a party, than the champion of truth. Yet what does Mr Faber collect from the pages of this historian? That the formation and establishment of Socinianism were entirely owing to the labours of Lælius and Faustus Socinus; and that these new apostles were Italians; the former of whom, before he had conversed with the reformers, was compelled in 1547, to retire from his country, on account of the disgust he had conceived against popery: whence he concludes, that the origin of Socinianism cannot be laid to the charge of Protestantism.* Mr Faber, however, must excuse me if I hesitate to subscribe either to the accuracy of his statement, or to the validity of his inference. That

* Faber's Answer.

the Socinians derive their name from Lælius and Faustus Socinus, the uncle and the nephew, but principally from the latter, is indeed true; it should, however, be remembered, that their principles are older than their name; and that before the birth of the elder Socinus, Luther had complained of the audacity of several among his disciples, who, usurping the privilege of their master, had erased from their creed the two great mysteries of the Trinity of God, and the redemption of mankind. Whether Lælius Socinus, before he left Italy, had conversed with any of the reformers, is what probably neither Mr Faber nor the Remarker can determine. That their writings were then known in that country, is certain; and that the “disgust of Socinus against the doctrines of “popery” was derived from them, is at least highly probable. After spending four years in different countries, and in the company of the most celebrated of the reformers, the Italian fixed his residence at Geneva. Here, by improving the doctrine of his masters, he soon learned to reject the mysteries which they still retained: but the flames that consumed Servetus, taught him to respect the stern infallibility of Calvin, and he was prudently satisfied with the silent belief of his own creed, without presuming to illuminate the minds of his brethren. The letters, however, which he occasionally wrote to the members of his family in Italy, procured a few converts to his opinions; among whom the most celebrated was his nephew,

Faustus. At his uncle's death, this young man became heir to his papers ; and, after spending ten years at the court of Florence, formed the design of announcing to the world the theological discoveries of his uncle, improved and perfected by himself. With this view he left Italy, where he had reason to fear the incredulity of the inquisition, as much as Lælius had feared the zeal of Calvin at Geneva. Switzerland was the first theatre of his labours ; from Switzerland he proceeded to Transylvania ; and thence, in 1579, passed into Poland. Poland was, at that period, the scene of religious dissension. Among the reformed churches within its limits, were reckoned no less than thirty different sects of Anti-trinitarians. To these Faustus applied ; and, after many fruitless negotiations, succeeded in collecting the most considerable into one society, in which his talents and credit gave him the most distinguished place, and the members of which afterwards assumed from him the name of Socinians.

But to judge of the origin of religious sects, we are not to look to the country in which some of their teachers may chance to have been born, but to the principles which they are acknowledged to profess. In the catechism of Racow, published by Socinus himself, we are told that the first, the most essential principle of their doctrine is, that the holy scriptures, interpreted by the private judgment of each individual, are the sole rule of faith. Now as this is the very doctrine which Luther promul-

gated, the very privilege which he claimed, when he first separated from the church of Rome, many years before the birth of Socinus, I think I may be justified when I assert that the latter was indebted to *him* for the very foundation of his religious creed ; and that, of consequence, the Socinians are the legitimate children of the reformation. It is indeed true, that Faustus pushed the principles of his teachers to their full extent : that, with heroic intrepidity, he embraced every consequence naturally deducible from them : and that, while other religious innovators stopped short in their career, he was consistent with himself, and continued to argue and reject till scarcely a single doctrine remained, which had formerly been thought peculiar to christianity. But hence it will not follow that he was descended from a different stock from his reforming colleagues. The only inference we can draw is, that he was a bold, stubborn, and undutiful child, who knew the privileges of his birthright, and would not be deprived of them by the frowns or prohibitions of an unreasonable parent. His exploits were thus recorded in his epitaph :

Tota quidem Babylon destruxit tecta Lutherus,
Muros Calvinus, sed fundamenta Socinus.*

* To strengthen his reasoning on this subject, Mr Faber gives his reader, from Mosheim, a list of persons, mostly Frenchmen and Italians, whom he considers as infidels ; and mentions a report that " in certain provinces of France and Italy, schools were

From the origin of infidelity, Mr Faber proceeds to the charge of idolatry. In support of his own opinion, and that of his bishop, he transcribes with an air of triumph, certain extracts from prayers contained in the Sarum Missal, once in use in this kingdom. They were originally collected by the orthodox zeal of his apocalyptic rival, Mr Whitaker, and may be found among the two hundred pages which that interpreter of the book of Revelations has very wisely devoted to the exposition of the corruptions of popery. And here I may be allowed to admire the ingenuity of our Protestant adversaries, who, when they extract from our books of devotion, what they deem objectionable passages, are careful to suppress every expression which might elucidate their true meaning.* I acknowledge that the prayers transcribed by Mr Faber, as they stand unconnected in his pages, appear

“erected, from whence swarms of impious doctors issued out to deceive the simple and unwary.” As these swarms of infidels, if they had ever existed, would have been easily traced to their hives, and the existence of these hives is only asserted on hearsay, we may reasonably consider them as the fabrications of prejudice or imposture. Of the names which he has mentioned, the greater part belong to men, who are well known to have lived and died in the christian faith; but what has this to do with the real point at issue between the Bishop and the Remarker? The latter had asserted, in answer to the Bishop, that the French infidels had learned their unbelieving system from the English deists and atheists. Will Mr Faber undertake to prove that the latter were the disciples of popery?

* Faber's Answer.

to ascribe to the saints more than can with justice be given to them: but I also maintain, that had Mr Whitaker transcribed other prayers, which he must have found in the same book, they would have explained the meaning of the former, and have shewn that it was easily reconcileable with the doctrine laid down by the Remarker. If I prove this to be true, it will be in vain that Mr Faber has pointed the horns of his dilemma against that author. They may both be broken at a single stroke.

I have it not in my power to consult the Sarum Missal at the present moment; but trust that the Sarum Portiforium, printed at London in 1555, and used in the same church, will be admitted as equal authority. From it I shall transcribe two prayers, which I have selected from several others of similar import, for no other reason than because they are addressed to the same saints as two of those adduced by Mr Faber. “ Holy Mary, succour the miserable, help the faint-hearted, comfort the afflicted, pray for the people, intercede for the clergy, make supplication for the devout female sex. Let all feel thy help, who celebrated thy holy memory. Be it thy care to pray assiduously for the people of God, as it has been thy happiness to bear the Redeemer of the world, Christ Jesus our Lord.” “ Holy Alban, protomartyr of the English, pour forth thy prayers to the Lord for the safety of the faithful. Amen.” Whatever Mr Faber may

think of the prayers quoted by him, I trust he will acknowledge that in these nothing more is requested than the friendly and charitable intercession of those to whom they are addressed. Now the person, who intercedes for a benefit, is essentially different from him who bestows it. The two ideas are so distinct, that they cannot be confounded. As long as I consider the saints as intercessors for grace and salvation, I cannot consider them as the bestowers of grace and salvation. Hence it seems to follow that, if the prayers quoted above have the meaning which I have affixed to them, the others must be explained agreeably to that meaning: and Protestants should learn what Catholics well know, that in every petition to the saints, whatever may be asked, their intercession is always expressed or understood. To consider them as the sources of grace, or the bestowers of favours, is a doctrine reprobated by the Catholic no less than the Protestant church: nor do we even believe that their intercession can be of any avail, but through the merits of Christ, their and our Saviour, their and our God.

Still, perhaps, it may be asked, can such prayers as those quoted by Mr Faber, have the meaning which I contend ought to be given to them? This question can only come from one who has been inattentive to the ordinary use of language. By a species of metonymy we frequently employ the subordinate for the principal agent, and attribute to the intercessor what we know is the office of his

superior. Let us suppose a criminal under sentence of death, who solicits the queen to obtain his pardon from the king. Were he in his petition to beg of her majesty *to save his life*, would Mr Faber contend that he had ascribed to the queen the power which the constitution has intrusted to the sovereign alone, and on that account indict him for misprision of treason, or a contempt of the king's prerogative? Undoubtedly he would not. Let him only apply the same rule to the Catholic prayers which he has condemned in his pamphlet, and he will readily acquit them of the guilt of idolatry.

Mr Faber, in his theological studies, has chosen for his master, a visionary writer of the seventeenth century, whose orthodox imagination, aided by his hatred of popery, enabled him to make new discoveries in almost every page of the sacred writings. Treading in the footsteps of Mede, he informs us that the praying to departed saints to intercede with God for us, is neither more nor less than the revival of the old pagan theology of interceding demons, and *is* of consequence an apostacy from the faith.* Is Mr Faber aware of the effects of the sentence which he has just pronounced? The custom of soliciting the intercession of the saints is, in my opinion, as old as christianity: our adversaries acknowledge that it was generally established in the beginning of the fourth century. It was

* Faber's Answer, p. 105.

then, even by their own account, practised by many of the martyrs, who laid down their lives in the cause of the gospel ; by all the holy and zealous missionaries, who, by their preaching, converted to the faith our barbarous forefathers, the Saxons, the Franks, the Goths, the Lombards, &c. ; by all who, during the eleven centuries preceding the reformation, had learned to bend the knee at the name of Jesus ; and, with the exception of a few Protestant churches, by every christian in the world, who has existed since that period. I mention not this as an appeal to authority ; but I do it to express my surprise, that any individual should presume, on his private authority, to cut off so large a portion of mankind from the fold of Christ, by pronouncing all of them to have been apostates from the faith of the gospel. What pontiff ever assumed a power equal to that of the Vicar of Stockton ? Involved in the same guilt, and the same unhappiness with so many millions of my brethren, I may be allowed to ask in their name and my own, on what grounds this damning sentence has been pronounced. The demons, he replies, were the souls of the illustrious dead, whose office was intercession between God and man : consequently to attribute a similar office to the saints, is a revival of the pagan worship. Without admitting this account of the demons to be perfectly accurate, I may still doubt the validity of the inference which is adduced from it ; and enquire whether Mr Faber be prepared to assert

that every resemblance between the rites and doctrines of a christian people, and the rites and doctrines of the pagan nations, be necessarily a revival of idolatrous worship, and an apostacy from the doctrine of the gospel. If he be, I hope he will not confine his reasoning to the christians in communion with the Bishop of Rome, but have the candour to extend it to every society to which it may apply. He will then, perhaps, discover that by his rule, Protestant churches are a revival of pagan temples, the Protestant hierarchy a revival of the pagan priesthood, and the spiritual supremacy of the king a revival of the pontifical power assumed by the pagan emperor. In the service of the established church, he will learn that the festival kept in memory of the restoration of royalty in the person of Charles II. is an imitation of the festival instituted in pagan Rome under the name of *Regifugium*, in memory of the establishment of Roman liberty: that the prayers in thanksgiving for the arrival of King William, are a transcript of those used at the pagan *Bohedromia*, to celebrate the arrival of Ion in Attica, to preserve the liberties of the Athenians: that the fast days annually appointed by the king, are copied from the *Feriæ imperativæ*, anciently appointed by the pagan Pontifex Maximus: and that the days of thanksgiving in honour of splendid victories, are a revival of the pagan supplications formerly decreed on similar occasions by the Roman senate. Indeed, were Mr Faber's principle once admitted,

I hardly know where we should be able to stop: our bench of bishops would be the pagan college of Pontifices, our agricultural societies the pagan *Fratres Ambarvales*, and our electioneering war-whoop of *no popery* the pagan cry of *Christianos ad leonem*, which so often resounded in the amphitheatres. In short, we should soon be transformed into a nation of pagans.

To confirm his reasoning, Mr Faber informs us, that this apostacy of the Catholic church was foretold by St Paul, who wrote to his disciple Timothy, that “in latter times some should depart
“ from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits,
“ and *doctrines respecting interceding demons.*” The last words are Mr Faber’s translation of *διδασκαλῖαι δαιμονίων*.*

Happy, who can this talking trumpet seize:

They make it speak whatever sense they please.

’Twas framed at first an Oracle t’ inquire;

But since each sect in prophecy grows higher,

The text inspires not them, but they the text inspire. }

DRYDEN.

It was not, indeed, my good fortune to study in any of the Protestant universities, among those who have acquired so much glory by “their labours in editing the Greek Testament.” At an early age I was compelled to quit my native country, and to seek the advantages of education in

* Faber’s Answer, p. 103.

one of those foreign Catholic universities, in which we know, from the Bishop of Durham, that ancient and sacred learning languish in a state of the utmost depression.* However, even there, I was able to glean sufficient information to know that Mr Faber's version, or interpretation, is far from being accurate. How will he prove that διδασκαλῖαι δαιμονίων mean *doctrines concerning interceding demons*? The obvious signification of the words is, *the teachings of demons*: of their intercession the apostle says nothing: for that improvement the sacred text is indebted to the ingenuity of Mr Faber. Neither is there any shadow of a proof that the demons mentioned by the apostle, are the souls of the illustrious dead: the following verses shew that they are false teachers, actually alive, and employed in the office of seduction: ἐν υποκρίσει ψευδολογῶν, κεκαυτηρησμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν, καλυπόντων γαμεῖν, &c. *who speak lies in hypocrisy, have their consciences seared, forbid to marry, &c.* Had Mr Faber confined himself to the common English version, his mistake might have been excusable. There the sense is ambiguous. In the Greek text it is plain. The participles in the second and third verses cannot agree with τινες, but must be referred to δαιμονίων: and consequently point out the demons as the living authors, not the dead objects, of the condemned doctrine.†

* Charge, p. 18.

† I know an attempt has been made to translate ἐν υποκρίσει

I must apologize to the reader's patience for adding another observation on this uninteresting subject; but it has acquired importance from the confidence with which the words of the apostle are quoted by our apocalyptic adversaries. I have already shewn that, if by our doctrine respecting the intercession of the saints we are apostates, the whole body of christians during at least eleven centuries, and the great majority of christians during the last three centuries, must be involved in the same guilt. Now I ask, whether it be possible to apply the prediction of the apostle to so numerous a body, to so many hundred millions of the professors of the christian name? Does St Paul say that all christians, or the greater number, or even that many among them would apostatize? No: only *some*, *τινες*, a word which to me appears to designate an inconsiderable sect, compared with the great society of christians. I may also add, that Mede's explanation was soon after refuted by the learned Protestant commentator Dr Whitby, who shewed that the prophecy of the apostle regarded not the present, but the first age of the christian church.*

On the subject of indulgences, and works of

ψευδολογων through the hypocrisy of false teachers; but this meaning is forced, unnatural, and unnecessary.

* As Mr Faber, after Mede, refers to St Epiphanius, let him consult that father (Hæres. 48): he will find that, in his opinion, the prediction was *evidently* verified in the heresy of the Cataphrygæ, and similar sects: *σαφως πεπληρωται*.

penance, Mr Faber, like his predecessors, has described indulgences as pardons, and works of penance as atonements of sin. In some of the preceding pages, this mistake has been already noticed: nor shall I fatigue the reader by a repetition of what I have previously advanced.* One line, however, has dropt from the pen of Mr Faber, which requires some observation. The Bishop of Durham, he tells us, “ does not censure the austerities of penance, *if found to be of any use.*”† What are we to infer from this vague and uncertain information? That the Right Rev. Prelate has not yet made up his mind on the utility of works of penance, and therefore does not chuse either to sanction or condemn them? This certainly displays a more amiable modesty, and less of a dogmatising spirit, than some persons have thought they discovered in his charge: but

* Perhaps the following passage from a Catholic divine, may convince him that we do not derogate from the efficacy of Christ's passion even by works, as they are called, of satisfaction. *Nulla prorsus est satisfactio, ab homine quovis peracta, quæ Deo sit grata, vel quæ sit alicujus omnino valoris, nisi per merita Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Christus est, qui solum vere et plene pro peccatis nostris satisfecit, ex quo omnis nostra satisfactio. Nostra namque satisfactio, qualis est, et quo modo nostra est, potius est quædam meritorum Christi nobis applicatio, quam propria aliqua satisfactio. Sicut autem per fidem, juxta aliquorum opinionem nobis applicatur Christi merita, ita et per quæcumque opera pia et in Deo facta. Nihil enim in nobis tanquam ex nobis, sed in eo qui nos confortat omnia possumus, &c.* Holden, *Analysis Fidei*, c. v. § 5.

† Faber's Answer, p. 101.

it should be remembered that christianity has now been preached about eighteen hundred years, and that it is certainly time that those, who are teachers of Israel, should be able to afford some information on so interesting a subject. That in the ancient church, the austerities of penance were deemed of great utility, is evident both from the ancient penitential canons, and the writings of the ancient fathers. In modern times it seems that they present a problem of considerable difficulty, which the prelates of the reformed churches, after three hundred years deliberation, are yet unable to solve.

On the nature of the provocation given by the Bishop's charge, Mr Faber has also fallen into a mistake. The Remarker did not complain that the Right Rev. Prelate had attempted to prove the truth of the Protestant, or to disprove the truth of the Catholic creed. This is a right which he will deny to no one. The subject of his complaint was, the unfair and uncandid manner in which he had conducted his attack. It was, that he had attributed to us doctrines, which we reprobate as sincerely as himself; and on the fictitious belief of such doctrines, had held us out to the contempt and execration of the public. When apocalyptic interpreters have recourse to such artifices to eke out their respective systems concerning the w—— of Babylon, we may amuse ourselves with the puny efforts of their bigotry or credulity. But the personal character, and the

high station of the Bishop of Durham, bestow a dignity and importance on such imputations, when he is their author. Then we owe it to ourselves, to our country, and to the truth, to vindicate our innocence. This was the provocation which originally called forth the pen of the Remarker. Nor has he any reason to regret the occasion, or the issue of the contest. He may say with Ajax, (nor will the public voice dispute the truth of my opinion),

Si quaeritis hujus

Fortunam pugnæ, non sum superatus ab illo.

OBSERVATIONS

ON SOME

FASHIONABLE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

Calvinus sapuit quia non scripsit in Apocalypsim.

SCALIGER.

DURING the long lapse of more than fifteen centuries, the visions of the apostle St John had been enveloped in the thickest obscurity. At the æra of the reformation, a strong ray of apocalyptic light dissipated the clouds which popery had raised: and since that period every old woman, of either gender, has been able to unravel with ease the web of mystery, and to reveal to the world the true meaning of the book of Revelations. From the days of Luther to the present, we have possessed a numerous and uninterrupted succession of translators, lecturers, expositors, and annotators, who may truly be said to have seen visions, and to have dreamed dreams: and, lest by

some mishap the pious race should become extinct, Bishop Warburton has left a fund for the support or the reward of the more fiery among its members.* I may admire his zeal, but not his wisdom. He probably did not see that he was thus endeavouring to diffuse and perpetuate an alarming species of intellectual disease, which, for the sake of distinction, I shall beg leave to call the apocalyptic mania. It has not, indeed, been hitherto classed in any system of nosology; but it is not on that account less real, or less general; and, I trust, I shall confer a benefit on the reader by proceeding to point out the origin, and to describe the symptoms of this theological malady.

When “the magnanimous fathers of the reformation” broke from the communion of the Catholic church, they found it convenient to justify their schism, by pleading that the Pope was Antichrist, and Rome the scarlet w—— of Babylon. This doctrine, while it inflamed the bigotry, flattered the spiritual pride of their disciples: with conscious superiority of birth, they sought in the apocalypse for proofs of the ignominious descent of their opponents, and their sacrilegious familiarity with the mysterious volume, quickly produced the disease, which is the subject of the present observations. Its progress was rapid. It soon perva-

* According to his will, an annual sermon is preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel, to prove the Pope to be Antichrist, &c. &c.

ded every department in life ; but its most distinguished victims were, and still are, chosen from among those churchmen, who, from the instructions of the nursery or the university, have imbibed a lively dread of the horrors of popery. The mania first manifests itself by a restless anxiety respecting the future fortunes of the church, and a strong attachment to prophetic hieroglyphics: the antichrist, and the man of sin ; the beast with ten horns, and the beast with two horns ; the armies of Gog and Magog ; the fall of Babylon, and the arrival of the millenium, become the favourite, the only subjects of study ; false and ridiculous perceptions amuse the imagination ; the judgment is gradually enfeebled, and, at last, the most powerful minds sink into the imbecility of childhood. Of the truth of this description we have a melancholy proof in the great Sir Isaac Newton. To him Nature seemed to have unlocked her choicest secrets : as a philosopher he was and is still unrivalled : but no sooner did he direct his telescope from the motions of the heavenly bodies to the visions in the apocalypse, than his head grew dizzy, the downfall of popery danced before his eyes, and he hazarded predictions which, on the scale of prophets, have placed him far beneath the well-known Francis Moore, physician and almanack-maker.

It should be observed, that this intellectual malady, like the other species of mania, assumes a thousand different shapes, according to the predisposition of the subject which it attacks. I shall

produce a few instances. In 1789, Mr Cook published a translation of the apocalypse, with keys to open its meaning to his readers. This reverend gentleman was Greek professor in the university at Cambridge; and, as his reading naturally led him to the Greek poets, he was determined that the author of the apocalypse should be a poet, and, moreover, the rival of Sophocles. In his opinion, the apocalypse is a tragedy formed on the same plan as the *Œdipus Tyrannus*. "The drama opens
 " with the temple scene: the seals, the trumpet,
 " and the vials unfold the plot; and though the
 " antichrist does not die, no more than *Œdipus*,
 " yet he falls into such calamity as makes him an
 " object of pity, and justifies the lamentations
 " pronounced on his downfall." Nor is this all. By trying one of his apocalyptic keys on the *Odyssey* of Homer, he has discovered that poem also to have been inspired, and informs us that the suitors of Penelope represent the vassals of popery, who, under the pretence of courting the bride, the christian church, devour all the good things in her house, till Christ, the true Ulysses, the *ὁδὸς ὁδοῦ* or safe way, arrives, and wreaks his vengeance on them. In Mr Granville Sharp, the favourite apocalyptic Nostradamus of the Rector of Newton Longville, (*Le Mes. reply*, p. 193, 202,) the mania has shewn itself in a different manner. This gentleman is known to be singularly partial to monosyllables. He has written a volume on the He-

brew letter vau, and another on the Greek articles α, η, το. From letters and articles, he was induced, by his previous success and the importunity of his friends, to proceed to the explication of the visions in the book of Revelations. Here the apocalyptic mania soon discovered itself: but the appearance of the disease was modified by his previous habits of monosyllabic investigation. He convinced himself that the name of the beast was Lateinos, and that Lateinos must signify the Latin church. The proof is curious. Lateinos, he contends, is derived from the Hebrew monosyllable LAT, which means to cover or conceal. Now the Latin church, in the celebration of the mass, conceals some of the prayers from the people, by ordering them to be pronounced with a low voice: therefore the Latin church is Lateinos, the beast in the apocalypse. Moreover the head of the Latin church resides in the palace of the Lateran, a name derived from the same monosyllable LAT; and the Lateran palace is situated in the country anciently called Latium, an appellation also derived from the same monosyllable LAT: and Latium is a province of that part of Europe called Italy, which also derives its name from the same monosyllable LAT. Be not startled, gentle reader: apocalyptic maniacs can with equal facility read backwards or forwards; and Mr Sharp informs us, that, if we read Italy backwards, we shall have Ylati, in the midst of which is the same Hebrew monosyllable

LAT.* Naviget Anticyram. In Mr Galloway the visions of St John assumed a different character, from the horror with which the interpreter viewed the French revolution. With him the beast of the bottomless pit was France, the little horn was France, the man of sin was France; and antichrist was France. Mr Galloway was a punster; and, during his apocalyptic paroxysm, he was unable to distinguish between a pun and a syllogism. The beast, he tells us, is *revolutionary* France, because the beast sprung from the earth, which is a *revolutionary* planet, performing diurnal *revolutions* round its axis, and annual *revolutions* round the sun.† With Messrs Kett and Bicheno, history appears to be the dominant idea. Mr Kett has sent St John to a cavern in the isle of Patmos, to employ himself in writing a prophetic history of England, describing in detail the miseries it should suffer under the iron yoke of popery, and its final liberation from them by the glorious revolution of 1688. Mr Bicheno has transferred the scene from England to Germany; but, lest the distance should lessen the interest of the book, in the judgment of the English reader, he has added a discovery, which must bring it

* Granville Sharp to the Hebrew Nation, p. 127—131.

† See Brief Commentaries on such parts of the Revelations and other prophecies, as immediately refer to the present times, by Joseph Galloway, Esq.

home to every heart. He assures us, that the present generation

(*O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint!*)

do actually enjoy, and have long enjoyed, the promised millenium of peace, virtue, and happiness!

Were I to describe all the varieties of the disease, these observations would swell to an unmeasurable bulk. I shall therefore content myself with noticing the prophetic, which is perhaps the most prevalent, species. When the mind is seized with this mania, the regions of futurity are instantly opened to its sight: it can point out the date and nature of every event which is to happen; it can inform us in what year popery, mohammedism, and infidelity are to perish; when and where antichrist is to be born, reign, and die; who is to restore the holy land to the Jews; and in what year the new Jerusalem is to descend from heaven. It is in vain that preceding prophets have frequently outlived their own predictions: the lessons of experience are heard with contempt: and each new seer is convinced of the truth of his own visions. Among those who have suffered lately under this form of the disease, the most distinguished are Mr Whitaker and Mr Faber, both scholars of extensive erudition, and both equally animated against the Church of Rome. They both agree that Luther is the angel

with the everlasting gospel ; and, if by his gospel they mean the doctrine noticed in the 148th page of this work, they have a chance to be right. It may be justly called everlasting ; for it will probably find proselytes as long as man shall dwell on the earth. Mr Whitaker discovers that the two horns of the beast are the two monastic orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans. Why they should claim the preference before their brethren, of greater antiquity, or more general diffusion, I know not ; but it is certainly unfortunate that the beast has not four horns : then you, ye sons of Benedict and Loyola, might have had the honour of being seated on the remaining two. The same gentleman informs us that the Ottoman empire will soon fall, Rome be wrested from the pope, and the seat of the papacy be transferred to Jerusalem. Mr Faber makes an equal display of erudition ; but the third angel, Mr Whitaker's Zuingle, he has placed in a most uncomfortable situation : he has bound him fast in the midst of the ocean, and transformed him into the *insular Church of England* ! Nor does he always agree with his rival in more important points. The two beasts he shews to be the two contemporary Roman empires, temporal and spiritual, under the emperors and the popes ; and gives his readers the pleasing intelligence, that both the Turk and the Pope will expire in the year 1868. Though he does not expect to witness this happy event

himself, yet he has the goodness to promise a sight of it to many of the present generation :—

Τλητε, φίλοι, και μείναι επί χρόνον, οφρα δαώμεν
Ει τιον Καλχας μαντεύεται, ηε και υκι.

Unfortunately for these two prophets, each disputed the accuracy of the predictions of his rival : an animated controversy followed ; and the result has been a conviction in the minds of most of their readers, that each has completely succeeded in demolishing the system of his adversary, and completely failed in establishing his own.

Thus have I attempted to describe the different symptoms of this disease : but I hope I shall be excused from indicating the method of cure. When the mania has once obtained possession of the brain, I doubt whether three Anticyræ would be sufficient to expel it. I would rather, like Dr Trotter in his treatise on the nervous temperament, endeavour to correct that *predisposition* which naturally leads to it. I would advise the Protestant theologian to suspend, for a while at least, his assent to some of those doctrines, which education has taught him to revere as sacred. I would have him learn to doubt whether it be certain, that a long succession of bishops, through many centuries, can be that one individual described by St Paul as the man of sin : or that the church, from which almost all other churches have

received the knowledge of the gospel, is “the great mother of harlots,” and the kingdom of Antichrist. I would recommend to him, if he must decypher the apocalyptic hieroglyphics, to attend to the solemn asseveration of their author, which is frequently repeated both in the first and the last chapters, that his predictions were, even at the time in which he wrote, on the point of being fulfilled. In the destruction of Jerusalem, and the first period of the christian history, he may find enough to exercise his ingenuity, and may perhaps stumble on the only clue which can lead to the solution of the difficulties contained in this mysterious volume. I am aware that what I ask, will not readily be granted to me. The doctrine that popery is the beast, the pope antichrist, and christian Rome the whore of Babylon, is, I know, an important part of the new gospel preached by Luther and his associates: it forms, to use the words of a learned prelate,* “a primary pillar of the reformed faith.” But when I consider the dangerous consequences of this doctrine, its deleterious effects on the judgment of some among the most distinguished writers of the Protestant communion, the ridicule which it serves to throw on the inspired writings, and the handle which it gives to the sneers and contempt of the professed infidel, I indulge a well-founded hope that, for the sake of religion and humanity, it will meet with

* Watson's Theological Tracts, vol. v, p. 7.

little support from the enlightened characters, who now preside in the established church. If it once formed a pillar of the reformation, I conceive it could only be a temporary support, which may now be removed without danger to the fabric. To the pious fraud, from its utility, the first reformers might easily reconcile their conscience: at the present day it may be rejected by their successors with some credit: it cannot be retained without disgrace.

THE END.

1848
The support in the establishment of the new party in the established church is not a pillar of the establishment, it could only be a temporary support, which may now be withdrawn without danger to the fabric. To the same mind I am inclined, that the numerous rights which remain their conscience, as the present law it may be regarded by their consciences with some degree of alarm, it should be retained without alteration.

A
L E T T E R

TO

A CLERGYMAN

OF

THE DIOCESE OF DURHAM,

IN ANSWER TO

HIS SECOND LETTER

TO THE

AUTHOR OF THE REMARKS

ON THE

BISHOP OF DURHAM'S CHARGE.

H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

THE H. A. T. H. A.

SIR,

AT last, after an interval of more than ten months, you have done me the honour to notice the Vindication of the Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge. There was an air of dignity in the length and obstinacy of your silence. It seemed as if the right reverend Prelate, conscious of the superiority of his cause, disdained any further defence. But your second letter has removed the mask, and has shewn, both how anxious was *his* wish, and how difficult was *your* task, to frame something like a specious reply. However, had you been content to oppose argument to argument, I should, without any apprehension of the result, have cheerfully left the decision of the controversy to the unbiassed judgment of our common readers. But, Sir, like a true son of the magnanimous parent of the reformation, you have sought to blacken the moral character of your opponent: and it is possible, that in minds unsuspecting of such artifices, the disgrace which you have attempted to fasten upon him, may injure the reputation of the cause which he has undertaken to defend. On this account I shall request the indulgence of my readers, while I make a few reflections, which may prove a short, but, I trust, a sa-

tisfactory refutation of the charges and mis-statements contained in your second letter.

You begin the attack, Sir, in the true spirit of theological chivalry. You point your spear with calumny, and attempt to bear down your adversary with abuse. You tell me that “ I stand no
 “ longer on the same footing of credibility as
 “ yourself: that I have been convicted of insincerity and misrepresentation: that I have offended less against the rules of logic than the laws
 “ of morality: that my language is equivocal, and
 “ adopted for the pious purpose of cajoling heretics: that I have been guilty of the most impudent and barefaced perversion of the testimony
 “ of ancient writings, that controversy even with
 “ papists can furnish: and that, before I can
 “ claim even the distinction of being refuted, I
 “ must first regain that fair character of honesty
 “ and sincerity, which the public will not cease to
 “ require in me as an author, however I may elude
 “ its indignation as a man.”* Courteous and gentle clerk, I thank you. But you will do me the favour to remember, that the points at issue between us are to be determined, not by invective, but by reasoning: and experience must already have taught you, that however willingly I may acknowledge the superiority with which you wield the weapons of abuse, I can have no reason to tremble before you in the field of argument. We

* Clergyman's 2d Letter, p. 2, 3, 21, 52, 72.

have both appealed to the public: the public must be our judge. If you think that the defence of the Bishop's charge cannot be conducted without invective and calumny, you have my hearty consent to use them. It is my good fortune to write in defence of a cause, which with conscious pride rejects the aid of such paltry and unworthy artifices.

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis.

You must therefore excuse me, Sir, if I do not detain either you or the reader, by refuting the charges which you have so wantonly advanced. As in the vindication I proved the truth of all the Remarker's statements, so in the present letter I trust to justify whatever I asserted in the Vindication. Should I effect this (and of my success I entertain not the smallest doubt) all your accusations, urged with so much noise and vehemence, will prove but empty sounds, harmless to me, and injurious only to their author.

The topics discussed in your introductory pages may be reduced to two,—whether Catholics may be believed when they explain their own creed, and whether to accuse them of impious and sacrilegious doctrines be to weaken the foundation of the christian religion. To your observations on each of these subjects I shall make a brief reply.

That it is ridiculous for any among us to claim belief to our statements of the Catholic doctrine, you assert, because we cannot point out any pro-

fession of faith, or any canons of our councils, universally admitted by Catholics; neither can we tell where the infallible authority of our church resides.* Now, Sir, in return, permit me to ask you “one very easy and simple question.” That both you and the Bishop of Durham are perfectly acquainted with the Catholic doctrine, cannot be doubted. That prelate, in his charge, kindly presented us with a profession of Catholic faith, and though a Catholic divine has protested against its contents, you have written two pamphlets to prove that it is, in every tittle, most correct and accurate. May I then take the liberty to ask, from what sources you and the bishop derived your statement of the Catholic creed? If from written documents, I trust these are as accessible to Catholics as to Protestants; if not, do, I pray, inform us of what colour was the spirit that so charitably instructed you. One of your predecessors, the illustrious Zuinglius, had also the advantage of a supernatural teacher, though it escaped his notice whether the doctor was white or black. *Nescio, albus an ater fuerit.*

To your question, where the infallibility of the Catholic church resides, I answer, in the episcopal college united to the pope. In return you will perhaps oblige me with the information, where the infallibility of the Established church resides. Say not, that you claim no infallibility. I talk

* Id. p. 4.

not of words but things: and it is evident that every sect, which possesses any church government, does in fact, and must exercise the privilege of infallibility.* Now I suspect, but with deference to your better judgment, that it resides in the high court of parliament. I know I can bring no text of scripture in support of my opinion; but I can appeal to what no orthodox clergyman dares reject, to the authority of an act of parliament.

“ Nothing shall henceforth be accounted heresy,
 “ but what is so adjudged in the holy scripture,
 “ or in one of the four first general councils, or
 “ in any other national or provincial council de-
 “ termining according to the word of God; or
 “ finally *which shall be so adjudged in the time to*
 “ *come by the court of parliament, with the assent*
 “ *of the clergy in convocation.*” 1 Eliz.

2. In the Vindication, I had asserted that the Bishop's charge was a libel on the veracity of

* Of late we have heard much of a new species of infallibility, the peculiar privilege of a class of ancient politicians. It seems that the men, who settled the principles of the exclusive system about the time of the revolution, were not liable to error. Their doctrines, we are told by persons, who profess themselves the bitterest enemies of civil and intellectual thralldom, are too sacred to be controverted: their authority is superior to argument: and while men, and manners, and opinions are daily changing, the restraints and exclusions adopted by them are to be perpetuated in defiance of reason, policy, and justice. This infallibility is now the grand argument of our political adversaries. It is the cloak with which they cover their own nakedness. They appeal to the wisdom of their ancestors, to conceal their own folly.

Christ, and that in its tendency it went to undermine the very foundations of the christian faith. To this you oppose an indignant answer. But, Sir, if the bill of impeachment drawn up by our Right Reverend accuser be true, it is also true that the whole christian church, for more than a thousand years before the reformation, professed doctrines derogatory from the honour of God the Father, from the mediatorship of God the Son, and from the divine influence of God the Holy Ghost. Now, Sir, can you think that it was to establish a church like this that the Saviour of mankind suffered on the cross? Can you believe that the eternal God would descend upon earth, submit himself to the infirmities of human nature, and undergo the most painful and disgraceful death, that he might leave behind him a race of men, who, instead of serving him in spirit and truth, should contaminate his worship by carnal observances and falsehood; and who, worse than the very pagans that knew him not, should pretend to serve him, while they worshipped idols; and should in reality deny the efficacy of his passion, while they pretended to place in it their only hope of salvation? Can you believe that after so many magnificent promises, after doing and suffering so much for the accomplishment of the great object he had in view, he would entirely abandon it during so many centuries, and reserve the regeneration of mankind to the piety of the eighth Henry, and the persecuting policy of the virgin queen, his

daughter Elizabeth? Truly, Sir, you must either acknowledge that the Bishop's zeal for what he thought the cause of truth, has carried him into the regions of fiction, or you must concede to the infidel, that the blood of Christ was shed in vain. You, indeed, tell us that the texts to which I alluded are misunderstood, and that among the popes there have been men of wicked lives. That I have given the true sense of the texts, I have no doubt; and, if some popes have disgraced their station by their vices, one of the apostles did so too. But this is foreign to our purpose. The true question between us is, how the doctrine of the Bishop can be consistent with the object of Christ's mission upon earth; and this question you very prudently evade. I therefore, a second time, request you will inform me, what answer you would give to the infidel, who should urge your opinion as a proof that christianity had not effected the purpose for which it was established, and who should thence infer that it was not in reality the work of God. This is a very serious difficulty, and deserves the attention of all those, whose zeal for the reformation prompts them to calumniate the Catholic church, at the expence not of truth only, but also of the gospel.

I. Of the subjects originally discussed by the Bishop of Durham, the first in order regards the meaning of these words of the decalogue: "thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image—
"thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, and

“serve them.”* Testimonies of respect are in themselves of an ambiguous nature: and for the sake of perspicuity I shall distinguish between religious respect, and divine worship. By the former I would understand an inferior kind of veneration exhibited from motives of religion; by the latter such as testifies the supreme excellence of its object, and cannot without impiety be offered to any but the divine Being. As graven images are allowed to be made among Protestants as well as Catholics, the true point in dispute between us will be, whether the reverence here forbidden to be shewn to them, be confined to divine worship alone, or should also include what I have termed religious respect. I maintain the former: you, Sir, are a strenuous advocate for the latter. I shall, therefore, beg the indulgence of the reader, while I lay before him the reasons on which I build my own opinion, and by which I hope to overturn yours.

1. In considering the decalogue, Protestant as well as Catholic divines are accustomed to distinguish the moral from the ceremonial parts of the law. The moral part depends on the nature of the actions commanded or prohibited; and, as this never changes, is of eternal obligation. The ceremonial part was peculiar to the Jewish system of religion, and consequently ceased to bind, the moment that system was abolished. To which of these divisions do you, Sir, refer the prohibition of

* Exod. xx.

making and worshipping images? If to the latter, it is no longer in force: it no more binds the consciences of christians than the precept which commanded the Jews to keep the Saturday holy.* If to the former, you must acknowledge that the wor-

* This is expressly the doctrine of a celebrated Protestant divine. "The second commandment, as it is positive, and was given to the Jews on account of the circumstances of time and place, binds the new people of Christ no more than the commandment respecting the Sabbath." Grotius. *Oper. theol.* Tom. 3. p. 485. Indeed without some such distinction, I know not how our reverend and right reverend accusers can justify their frequent violation of one or more of the prohibitions contained in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Their charity has a store of indulgence for their own appetites; it has none for the consciences of their Catholic brethren. If a Catholic say his prayers before a crucifix, their piety is alarmed. He is an idolater, they exclaim: he violates the second commandment, he derogates from the honour of God the Father. Now, when a clergyman eats a black-pudding to his dinner, does he not violate the prohibition of eating blood, published by the apostles: does he not know, that whoever despises them, despises him that sent them: and hence will it not follow, that he also derogates by his disobedience from the honour of God? If he say in his defence, that the prohibition was only temporary, why may not the Catholic say the same with respect to the prohibition of images? To me at least our Protestant black-pudding eaters appear to stand in a very dangerous predicament. The prohibition is declared to be issued in the name of the Holy Spirit. It is express, without any limitation as to time or place. It is conceived in the same words as the prohibition of fornication. Now as their faith is, or pretends to be, built on scripture, and scripture alone, I could wish to know how they can without scruple continue to eat blood, unless the prohibition has been repealed by the infallible omnipotence of an act of parliament?

ship prohibited, is in its own nature immoral: whence I shall deduce this consequence, that it cannot be the religious respect which the Catholic church allows to be paid to images. Were such respect naturally immoral, it must be, because no reverence whatever can be lawfully exhibited to inanimate objects: an opinion, which I have already proved to be false, from numerous instances recorded in holy writ. Your orthodoxy, indeed, has pronounced that they have no relation to the subject: as, however, I am of a different opinion, I shall offer no apology for recalling them to your recollection. If to pay religious respect to an inanimate object be naturally unlawful, why did Joshua “fall on his face to the earth before the ark “of the Lord,” or why did David introduce it with so much solemnity into the city of Zion? Why were the Beth-Shemites smitten because they looked into the ark; or the anger of God kindled against Uzzah because he took hold of it? Why was Moses bidden to put off his shoes on mount Horeb, *because* it was holy ground; or why did the psalmist exhort the Israelites to bow themselves down to the footstool (the ark) of God, *because* it was holy?*

* Ps. xcix. 5. In the present Protestant bible we read, “worship *at* his footstool, because *he* is holy.” The original expression is the same here as in the commandment: I have therefore employed the same English phrase, suspecting that the present orthodox reading may have been inspired by that horror for popery which animated the industry of our translators. They

Protestant exhorted to kneel before that orthodox image of the Redeemer, “ those bodily elements “ of earthly manufacture,” the bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper ?* From these instances it must be evident to every reader, that there is nothing naturally immoral in the mere exhibition of religious respect to an inanimate object : and hence I think myself authorized to infer that the worship prohibited by the commandment is of a different tendency, a worship which goes “ to make them “ our gods.”

2. That the prohibition is confined to a worship of this nature is, I think, evident from the very reason on which it is grounded : that “ God is a “ jealous God :” one who will not permit the reverence due to himself to be given to another : and who consequently forbids *divine honour* to be paid to images.†

had indeed received the plenitude of the spirit : for they not only reformed the church ; they even reformed the scriptures.

* There is a rubric to explain this ceremony, the history of which is curious. It was first inserted in the book of common prayer by the authority of Edward, the infant head of the church. It was afterwards expunged by the superior illumination of his sister, his female successor in that ecclesiastical dignity. It was lastly restored with honour to its original place by the less fallible judgment of another head of the church, of mature age and of the male sex, Charles the Second. The policy of Elizabeth was to allure the Catholics within the pale of orthodoxy : that of Charles to soothe the resentment, and silence the scruples of the presbyterians.

† This also is the reasoning of a celebrated Protestant divine. The second commandment, says Thorndike, setting forth God for

3. As soon as the ten commandments had been delivered to the Jews, Moses, at their request, entered the darkness to speak privately with the Lord. The first words addressed to him on this occasion, contain an evident allusion to the prohibition of image-worship. “Ye have seen that I
 “ have talked with you from heaven. Ye shall
 “ not make with me Gods of silver, neither shall
 “ ye make unto you Gods of gold.”* Now these words appear to me to prove, as forcibly as words can prove, that the worship forbidden to be paid to images, was divine worship, or such as would make them Gods. I omit many other passages of similar import, which occur in the Old Testament.

Having thus shewn you some of the reasons which induced me to assert that by this commandment was prohibited “the making of images so as
 “ to adore and serve them, that is to make them
 “ our Gods,” I shall proceed to notice the five arguments by which you have attempted to prove my opinion to be false.

1. You assert that in this hypothesis the words

a God that is jealous of his people, whether they worship him or not, manifestly supposeth their covenant to forsake all other Gods beside him, a contract of marriage between him and his people, which if it be so, it is no less manifest that the images which the precept supposeth, are the representations of other Gods, which his people were wont to commit adultery with by worshipping them.

Thorndike, *Weights and Measures*, p. 166.

* Exod. xxi. 22.

forbidding the worship of images would be only a weak and partial repetition of the preceding prohibition of false Gods. I answer that it is not a repetition, but an explanation. It extends the prohibition of having other Gods to the usual method of worshipping them by idols. Hence we perpetually find in scripture these two phrases, the worship of images, and the worship of other Gods, used indiscriminately for each other. See 1 Kings, xiv. 9. 2 Kings, xvii. 35. 41. Is. xlv. 15. 17.

2. To your question why we should depart from the obvious meaning of the terms, I reply that I have already shewn the obvious meaning to agree not with your opinion, but with mine.

3. Your reference to Deuteronomy c. iv. is far from being conclusive. The reason there expressed does not, in my judgment, “ clearly intimate “ that the commandment forbids to worship the “ true God by any image,” but forbids the Israelites to make an image, and worship it as the true God. Therefore Moses adds, “ and lest “ thou lift up thy eyes unto the heaven, and “ when thou sees the sun and moon, &c. shouldst “ be driven to worship them and serve them.”

4. You appeal in support of your opinion, to the idolatry of Jeroboam, who made two calves of gold, and said to the people, “ behold thy Gods, “ O Israel, which brought thee out of the land of “ Egypt.” This very text, if I can understand it, proves that Jeroboam meant to give divine honour

to the idols. To you it appears otherwise ; and in support of your opinion you have pursued a very ingenious train of argument through the two following pages. But it frequently happens that an orthodox imagination, while it employs itself in filling up the chasms, overlooks the express assertions, of the scriptures. Positive as you may be, that Jeroboam only intended to worship the God of Israel with the aid of these images, you will allow me to give more credit to the declaration of God himself, who says, that Jeroboam had done evil above all that were before him, because he had made him *other* Gods and molten images, and had cast God behind his back.*

5, Your last argument is drawn from the conduct of the Jews, “ who declared to Pilate that “ their law was violated by the little images of eagles “ annexed to the Roman standards, and told Vitellius that the laws of their city forbade them to “ suffer an image to be brought into it.” But permit me, Sir, to ask you whether these images were objects of pagan worship, or were merely intended for civil and military purposes. If the former, they can have no reference whatever to the present controversy: if you prefer the latter, you must admit that every kind of image, whether it be intended for a religious, civil or military purpose, is equally forbidden by the commandment. But this concession will necessarily defeat

* 1 Kings xiv. 9.

your own argument. From it will follow, either that the prohibition of images was a part of the ceremonial law, and consequently abrogated by the introduction of christianity, or that Protestants no less than Catholics live in the habitual violation of the commandment, and of course are included in the Bishop's censure of derogating from the honour of God the Father. In either case I trust we must be acquitted even by our adversaries. I shall now proceed to your observations on the councils.

Educated from my infancy in the Catholic faith, and employed during many years in teaching its principles to others, I conceived myself as well qualified as any Protestant prelate could be, to inform the public what are our real sentiments with respect to the worship of images. I presumed therefore to observe, that the respect which we allow to be paid to them, is such as a subject may pay to the effigy of his sovereign, or such as nature prompts a child to pay to the portrait of a deceased parent.* To a respect of this description you have not dared to object: but you dispute my sincerity, and roundly assert that "the allegation is false in fact." At this I was not surprised. I knew how testy some persons are when their favourite opinions are contradicted. But I was truly surprised when I found you appealing to the authority of the council of Trent!

* Vindic. p. 12.

Now, Sir, what is there in the acts of that council, that authorises any other species of worship than such as I have described? Is it where we are told that there is no divinity or virtue in images, on account of which they are to be respected: that nothing is to be prayed from them: that no confidence is to be placed in them? No; but the council says, “that the honour, which is paid to
 “them, is referred to the prototypes which they
 “represent: so that by the images, which we
 “kiss, and before which we uncover our heads,
 “and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ him-
 “self.” Here you fix your foot, and assert that in these words may be traced a wish to encourage the giving of divine worship to images. “Of
 “course,” you infer, (reader, attend; such precious specimens of theological reasoning are not frequently to be met with) “the various acts of
 “devotion, which it would be proper to exhibit,
 “if the divine Redeemer were personally present,
 “may with *equal propriety* be directed to his
 “images, as long as we keep in mind that they
 “are only the types and representations of his
 “divinity. Such is the plain meaning of the
 “words.”* Now, Sir, you perhaps may have seen the spiritual and temporal peers, in the house of lords, bow to the empty throne: your horror of popish rites may have induced you to demand an explication of this idolatrous custom, adopted

* Second Letter, p. 15.

even by Protestant prelates: and you may have received for answer, in the words of the council, that the honour which is immediately paid to the throne, is referred to the king whom it represents, and that through it the peers, when they bow before it, shew their respect to his majesty himself. But, Sir, could you infer from this explanation that in the opinion of the house of lords, and consequently of the whole bench of bishops, the various acts, which it would be proper to exhibit, if the sovereign were personally present, may with equal propriety be directed to the throne? If such reasoning be admitted, we shall behold the next new bishop kissing the throne instead of kissing hands, on his promotion; we shall hear the archbishop of Canterbury, on the next birth-day, addressing a speech of congratulation to the throne; and we shall perhaps see you yourself, should his majesty deign to notice your efforts in the defence of your prelate, and dole out to you a pittance from the loaves and fishes, expressing your gratitude, not to the royal donor himself, but to his parliamentary representative, the throne.

2. From the council of Trent we ascend to one of higher antiquity, the second council of Nice. It is with visible complacency you enter on this part of your subject: and while your humanity affects to pity the thralldom of the Catholic intellect, forced "to gorge itself with so gross a meal," your orthodoxy exults in the imaginary prospect of an

easy victory. Perhaps, Sir, the few reflections which I am going to make, may induce you to lower your tone, and to doubt whether you had not better have allowed the old bishops, who composed this council, to sleep in peace, with all their miracles and images, than have disturbed their repose to make them bear witness against you.

1. With the false notion which you have formed of the Catholic doctrine, you will, perhaps, be surprised to learn, that there occur, in the acts of this council, histories, to which I am as little disposed to give credit, as you can be yourself: and that of the authorities quoted by the members, though many are authentic, there are also many, which Catholic writers have not hesitated to pronounce spurious or doubtful.

2. You will, probably, be still more surprised, when I venture to inform you, that the acts of this council are of no authority in the Catholic church. We assent, indeed, to the doctrinal decree passed in the last session, which was approved by the popes: but in the acts and canons, much is contained to which the Roman church would never impart its sanction. *Quæ apud nos nec habentur, nec admittuntur*, says Anastasius Bibliothecarius, a Roman writer of the same age.

3. Should you even succeed in proving that the council allowed divine worship to be paid to images, what inference could you draw from it? That Catholics at the present day admit the same doctrine? I see not by what laws of reasoning such a conclu-

sion can be established. Our present doctrine is a fact which cannot be set aside by argument : and all that the eight pages which you have devoted to this subject can possibly prove, is, not that we give to images the worship due to God, but that we are wrong in believing that the council of Nice did not. This, however, is a point foreign to the Bishop's charge.

4. But, Sir, it would be uncourteous to dismiss your arguments with no further comment. The industry with which you have toiled through so many folio pages in the pursuit of an *ignis fatuus*, undoubtedly deserves to be rewarded with an answer. After a long and tedious ramble, you returned, it seems, to your desk, in possession of two important passages, which you considered as incontrovertible proofs of your accusation. But by some mischance, for which it is not my province to account, though you discovered these, you did not discover a hundred other passages, which would have solved every difficulty, and shewn an exact agreement between the doctrine of the council and the doctrine contained in the Vindication. Your love of truth, Sir, your candour and sincerity will undoubtedly thank me, if I lay some small part of that, which you omitted, before the eyes of our readers. They will be the better able to judge between us.

The short passage which I inserted in the Vindication from the doctrinal decree of the council, " that the only worship allowed to images was an

“ honorary worship, not the true worship belonging to God alone,” is repeatedly enforced and elucidated in different parts of the acts. The members there inform us, that in the Greek language, words expressive of respect, are of themselves ambiguous: but that, whenever they apply them to images, they wish to point out a species of reverence far inferior to that which is the exclusive right of the Divinity: that they do not pay any respect to the matter or the colours of images; but by them are put in mind of the original, to whom they pay such honour as is due: that they do not call images Gods, nor serve them as Gods, nor place their hope of salvation in them, nor give them divine honour: that all such assertions are the calumnies of their enemies: (perhaps some bishop had been preaching a charge against them) that they give not to images that adoration, which is made in spirit and truth: and that they know images to be nothing else than mere imitations of the originals.* To these testimonies I may be allowed to add the following solemn address to our blessed Redeemer. “ Never have we been perverted to offer to any creature under heaven the adoration due to thee. To thee alone, our Saviour, we sing: besides thee, O Lord, we know no other.”† Certainly, no man can attentively and impartially consider these pas-

* Labbè, p. 582, 185, 412, 454, 521.

† Ibid. p. 484.

sages, and still believe that the council ordered divine worship to be given to images.

In the face, however, of these repeated professions of their faith, you still dare to accuse them of an idolatrous worship. They allow incense to be burnt, and tapers to be lighted, in honour of images. "Is this," you exclaim, "the respect which nature prompts a child to pay to the portrait of his deceased parent?" Why, Sir, did you not add the rest of the passage as it stands in the Vindication: "or which a subject may lawfully pay to the effigy of his prince?" Probably for this reason, that it shews at once the emptiness of your objection. The christians of the east were accustomed to light tapers, and to burn incense before the statues of the emperors. It was the very token of respect exacted from the subject towards the effigy of his prince. You could not be ignorant of it. You had partly read it in the Vindication: you had repeatedly read it in the acts of the council:* and as you yourself do not condemn such a respect, to be consistent with yourself, you must acquit the council. I acknowledge that this custom will appear very strange to a mere untravelled Englishman: but you, Sir, cannot be ignorant that the manners of different people are different, and that the exuberant ceremonial of the east is not to be estimated by the cold phlegmatic temper of the northern nations. The other cir-

* P. 49, 60.

cumstance which scandalizes you, is, that the council says, "we are made partakers of some sanctification through them." But this difficulty will be easily solved by a comparison. If when I bow my head at the name of Jesus, I mean to honour my Redeemer, I perform an action pleasing in his sight: and if I perform an action pleasing in his sight, I obtain some spiritual benefit to my soul, or, in the language of the council, I become partaker of some sanctification. Now, as no reason can be given why I may not bow when I see the representation of his sufferings, as well as when I hear the sound of his name, I cannot conceive why I may not then also be said to receive some spiritual benefit to my soul, or to become partaker of some sanctification.

These reflections will, I trust, suffice to vindicate the doctrine of the council, in the mind of the impartial reader. I shall proceed to notice your animadversions on the different speeches of its members. In the first session was read an epistle from Pope Adrian, declaring what was the faith of the Roman church on the subject of images: and to this faith the whole council declared its unqualified assent. From that moment the great object of the meeting was accomplished: but on the following days several of the members were permitted to propose and explain their respective sentiments. With respect to doctrine, all were agreed: but their discourses prove that some among them were no great adepts in the art of criticism, or were

possessed of a greater share of credulity than has fallen either to your lot or mine. One of them gravely told a story, ridiculous enough, of an old monk who was so harassed by the repeated assaults of the devil, that at length he entered into a sort of compromise with him. The bargain was made: but the conscience of the monk was not at peace. He consulted a neighbouring abbot; and it is of your translation of the answer attributed to this old gentleman that I conceive I have a right to complain. The abbot replied that the monk had better have yielded to the temptation than have “refused to honour our Lord God Jesus Christ with his mother in the image.” With the propriety of the advice I have no concern: but may I ask why, instead of this expression, you have adopted the following words, “rather than deny to worship the image in question.”* That you attach some importance to them is evident, from your having printed them in italics: and that you would have the reader believe them to be the very words of the abbot, I may infer from your having placed them within inverted commas. Now, Sir, do you believe these two expressions to convey to the mind exactly the same idea? If so, why did you abandon that in the original, and prefer one of your own coinage? Do you believe that they have different meanings? If so, I cannot conceive by what arguments you can reconcile

* Second letter, p. 19.

it with your sincerity to have corrupted the writer whom you were translating. Had I been guilty of such a mistatement, how fervently would your orthodoxy have declaimed against the dishonesty and misrepresentations of popish controvertists ! But it is a truth which experience has long since established, that those are the first to suspect others of dishonesty, who are addicted to it themselves.

Among the articles which the policy of our enemies has added to our religious creed, is one of a most pernicious tendency : that faith is not to be kept with heretics. Were this the place, it would not, perhaps, be difficult to shew, that our adversaries themselves have a better claim to the honour of this doctrine. Of my readers, those who are conversant with the history of the revolution, must know that there was such a thing as the treaty of Limerick : and those who have watched the course of events during the present reign, will retain some faint recollection of a certain promise made to the Catholics of Ireland. That you, Sir, wish to uphold this baseless calumny against us, I do not mean to assert : yet I cannot conceive for what other purpose you have dragged into discussion the decree of the council of Nice respecting the oaths of the Iconoclasts. It will not be difficult to justify that decree. During a paroxysm of religious phrenzy, some zealots had bound themselves by oath to destroy every image. The council considered their conduct as impious, and of course pro-

nounced their oath to be invalid. Now what is there to reprehend in such a decision? Were one of your parishioners to swear on the bible that he would burn the communion table in your church, would you maintain that he was bound to observe his oath?

From the scriptures, and from councils, you appeal to the ancient schoolmen. As if you had been delegated by the Almighty to visit the iniquities of the parents on their children, not merely to the fourth, but to the twentieth generation, you condemn us of idolatry, because you fancy you have found idolaters among our predecessors some centuries ago. If the old schoolmen really taught an idolatrous doctrine, it was their misfortune: let them answer for it. With their opinions the catholics of the present day have no concern. Why must I be an idolater, because a Spaniard or an Italian was an idolater in the fifteenth or sixteenth century? The schoolmen were fond of subtle and metaphysical distinctions: they often endeavoured to explore the mysteries of religion till they were lost in an abyss of obscurity; but they laid no claim to infallibility, nor exacted from their brethren an unqualified assent to their opinions. We consider them as private unauthorised individuals. If their doctrine be conformable to that of the church, we admit it: if not, we reject it. We neither subscribe to all their opinions, nor have we to answer for their occasional errors.

But you say, “ they were men celebrated in their generation.” Why so were Luther and Calvin; they were also celebrated in their generation: they were the fathers, the saints of the reformation. But are you willing to be accused of favouring the impure doctrine that teaches the lawfulness of substituting on some occasions the handmaid for the wife, because it was preached by the magnanimous Luther:* or of believing that the God of all goodness is the great author of sin, because that opinion was sported by the piety of Calvin?† Undoubtedly you are not. Permit me then in like manner to spurn the impious doctrines, which you are pleased to ascribe to catholics, on what you conceive to be the authority of the ancient schoolmen.

With this answer I should have been content, had you not accused me of misrepresentation and perversion in the manner in which I treated this subject in the Vindication. I owe it to myself to repel a charge, of which I am conscious that I am not guilty. I asserted that when the old schoolmen allowed the worship of Latria to be given to the cross of Christ, they only meant an inferior honour, which might be termed Latria, because its ultimate object was Christ. It was from the object in which it terminated, that it received its denomination. To this plea you think proper to de-

* Si domina nolit, adveniat ancilla. Op. Luth. Tom. v. fol. 123.

† Calv. de prædes. p. 727.

mur; and found your objection on the authority of Bellarmine, who, if we may believe you, “un-
 “able to reconcile the language of St Thomas
 “and his followers with the express words of the
 “second council of Nice, which defines the wor-
 “ship due to images to be inferior to Latria,*
 “rationally concludes that Aquinas had never
 “heard of the acts of that council.” I have
 sought for this rational conclusion in the works of
 Bellarmine, and in the chapter to which you refer:
 but have not been so fortunate as to find it.† I
 do not, however, regret my trouble: as it has
 disclosed to me some circumstances to which it
 was your duty to attend. Bellarmine, indeed,
 disapproves of the language adopted by the school-
 men, not however because its meaning was ido-
 latrous, but because it might be misunderstood;‡
 a prediction, which you, Sir, have laboured with
 much industry to verify. Instead of attributing
 to them the doctrine, which on his authority you
 pretend to affix to them, and through them to
 the whole body of Catholics, he observes that it
 is evident from their works, that they speak not of
 a proper but an improper kind of Latria: and

* So, Sir, it appears that you have at length discovered that
 the council did not allow divine worship to be paid to images.
 Had you discovered it sooner, it might have spared both our
 readers and ourselves no little trouble.

† Lib. 11, c. 22, de imag. Lugduni, 1557.

‡ Ibid.

that they mean an imperfect worship, which analogically may be reduced to the species of worship due to the original: in other words, a worship which may be said to be of the same kind, because it is referred to the same object.* Hence, Sir, our readers may see, with how much reason you have opposed Bellarmine to me on this subject. Were you conscious of the rectitude of your cause, what need was there of such an unjustifiable artifice?

It is, however, proper that I explain more fully the sentiments or rather the language of those, whom you have so rashly condemned. It is not a very amusing, or very interesting subject. But to my readers I shall offer no apology. If I lead them through an obscure and dreary path, to you they are indebted for whatever there may be unpleasant and tedious in the journey. You have chosen to build your fortress in this Sierra, and have intrenched yourself in it amid the metaphysical subtleties, and Aristotelian distinctions, of the schoolmen. It is my duty, and I trust, will be my good fortune, to expel you from it.

The principal difficulty in understanding the language of these ancient divines arises from a partial acquaintance with their works, different passages of which mutually serve to elucidate each other. They were accustomed to divide respect into two species, which were denominated

* Id. c. 23, 25.

from their objects, latria and dulia. Latria was that respect, which had God for its ultimate object: dulia that which was paid to any created being. Each of these, if considered according to their acceptance in common language, might be subdivided into different classes: but considered strictly according to their ultimate object, they admitted of no division. Hence every demonstration of respect to an angel or a man, to the king or to his throne, was denominated dulia, because it was ultimately referred to a creature: and in like manner every demonstration of respect to Christ or to his cross, was denominated latria, because it was ultimately referred to Christ. In support of this language they urged, that the respect shewn to the image did not stop at the image, but proceeded to the original:* and hence inferred that the cross of Christ was adored with the same kind of worship as Christ himself, in the same manner as the purple of the king is honoured with the same honour as the king himself:† a comparison which is alone sufficient to vindicate them from all the

* *Motus autem qui est in imagine, prout est imago non sistit in ipsa, sed tendit in id, cujus est imago, et ideo ex hoc quod imaginibus Christi exhibetur religionis cultus, non diversificatur ratio latriæ.* St Thom. 2a. 2æ. q. 81. art. 3. Thorndike's language is similar to this. "Indeed and in truth, it is not the image but the principal that is honoured by the honour that is said to be done to the image because it is done before the image," *Weights and Measures*, p. 128.

† *Sicut purpura regis honoratur eodem honore quo rex.* Id. q. 103. art. 4. et 3. parte, q. 25. art. 4.

charges which you have brought against them. I do not, any more than Bellarmine, approve of this language, because it may be misunderstood by those who are not conversant with it; but I contend that had they maintained the present Protestant doctrine respecting the duty of bowing at the name of Jesus, they would have adopted the same reasoning as you have selected from their works respecting the worship of the cross. They would have said that the name of Jesus ought to receive the adoration of latria, because the honour paid to the name does not stop at the name, but proceeds to him whom it represents. They would have argued like St Thomas, that the name of Jesus receives no reverence in as much as it is a sound: that it is revered therefore as the denomination of Christ; and that of course the reverence paid to the name of Jesus must be the same as is paid to Christ himself:* or like St Bonaventure, that we bow to the name of Jesus as to a rational being, therefore we bow to it as to Christ himself: but as we bow we worship; therefore we ought to worship the name of Jesus as Jesus himself.† To us accustomed to a different language, such conclusions appear at first sight very extraordinary: but in themselves they are innocent, and shew that the schoolmen meant no more by giving latria to the cross, than Protestants do by bowing to the name of Jesus. And here, Sir, to leave

* Second Letter, p. 28.

† Id. p. 27.

the language of the schoolmen, and to adopt a short sentence from your letter, perhaps by this time you may begin to repent your bold repetition of the assertion, that St Thomas, St Bonaventure and Cajetan do hold the idolatrous doctrine which in your first letter you ascribed to them.*

The heavenly seed which the Bishop of Durham so bountifully scattered from the pulpit, did not fall on a rocky or ungrateful soil. Whoever compares the few lines within which he comprised his first accusation, with the many pages into which it has been multiplied in your letter, must be convinced that the produce has been a hundred fold. This increase, the orthodox churchman may, perhaps, assume as an argument in favour of his cause; but the obstinacy of the Catholic will contend that an assertion, which required so many arguments for its support, must have been built on a very sandy foundation. From the charge against our intellects we now pass to a charge against our conduct. Hitherto we are supposed to have misunderstood the meaning of the commandment, now we are accused of having suppressed it. One accusation destroys the other. If we mistake the meaning of the commandment, what motive can we have to suppress it? If we have suppressed it from improper motives, how can it be that we have misunderstood its meaning? The whole charge appears to me the blundering job of some clumsy

* Id. p. 30.

workman. It dies *felo de se*; and a jury may be impannelled to decide whether it deserves the honour of christian burial.

In the Vindication I had proved this part of the Bishop's accusation to be unfounded, from the absurdity and impractability of the attempt. I had asked by what authority the suppression had been made? By the bull of what pope? By the decree of what council? In what manner it had been made? What advantage could result from it? To these questions you have returned no answer: nor do I blame you. You could return none that would have been satisfactory. But one thing I take upon me to blame: and that is, that with the consciousness of your inability to reply, you have still come forward, and in defiance of fact and argument have repeated the accusation. Had you made any new discovery since your first letter, you certainly had a right to state it; but I observe that your discoveries are at an end, and that you have confined yourself to a few cavils against certain passages in my answer. To these I shall now reply.

You accuse me in the first place, of shifting the question from a particular to an universal, and of insinuating that the Bishop speaks of the present time, and not of an artifice that ~~was~~ adopted in past ages. On the contrary I am ready to affirm, that the Bishop did speak of the present, as well as of any former period. I know that many, and I believe that all who heard, or who have read his

charge, will, on this point at least, agree with me. It is true that he said an artifice *was* adopted, though he had too much prudence to state the time when, or the author by whom it was adopted: but it is also true that he said, “in the enumeration of the ten commandments the second *is* wholly suppressed.” If *was* necessarily refer to the time past, I conceive that *is* refers as necessarily to the time present: nor can I doubt that his Lordship meant to assert that Catholics not only have suppressed, but still continue to suppress the second commandment. However I did not confine my observations to the present day: whoever reads the Vindication, will find that my arguments refer not only to the *is* but also to the *was* of the accusation, and shew that if in some few instances the words were omitted, that omission did not arise from any improper motive, but from reasons which every impartial judge must approve.

Among the books of instruction which I mentioned, was the Catechismus Romanus; on which you observe that you should, indeed, have been astonished, had it not contained the commandment. I, however, am at a loss to explain your astonishment. If your accusation be true, the omission would have been the most natural thing in the world. The catechism was compiled for the use of the curates. They were ordered to study, to explain and read it to their parishioners. If then the Catholic church had wished to withhold

the knowledge of the commandment from the people, would she have inserted it in a book of this description: or if she did, would she not at least have admonished the curate of the necessity of suppressing it in his public instructions? The opposite conduct which she pursued is, I think, a convincing proof of her innocence. Besides the *Catechismus Romanus* I had also referred to the *Institutions of Canisius*. Your observations on this reference are so very pertinent, and so very orthodox, that I shall beg leave to transcribe them, for the information and edification of the public.

“What was my surprise,” you exclaim, “and
 “what will be the surprise and indignation of my
 “readers, when in this very tract, so daringly, and
 “so unreservedly brought forward by yourself,
 “the commandment, instead of being given entire,
 “is presented to us only in the following corrupt
 “and mutilated form! *Non facies tibi sculptile ut
 “adores illud.* I will not characterize this proceeding with any epithet. I will only ask,
 “whether the subornation of such testimony
 “must not convince every unprejudiced reader, of
 “your utter inability to repel by honest evidence
 “the accusation urged against your church.” In writing this did you not pray with the poet?

Pulcrâ Lavernâ,

*Da mihi fallere, da justum sanctumque videri
 Noctem peccatis et fraudibus objice nubem.*

In defiance, Sir, of your real or pretended indignation, I shall still beg leave to refer to Canisius. The dispute between us is not respecting the abridgment, but the suppression of what you call the second commandment. Now I contend that in this abridgment of Canisius, "thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing to worship it," there is no suppression. Some of the words of the prohibition are, indeed, omitted: but the sense is preserved, not suppressed. Do you object to the phrase, to worship it, which is adopted instead of, thou shalt not worship it? I answer that these words present the true meaning of the original, and that Canisius may justify himself by the example of St Stephen, who, in quoting the prophet Amos, adopts the same mode of expression: "figures which ye made to worship them." But, Sir, is it certain that you are correct in your account of this work? That it contains the passage, which you alledge, I am ready to confess: but if you mean to insinuate that it contains nothing more, you egregiously deceive your readers. The whole commandment at full length, copied verbatim from the twentieth chapter of Exodus, occurs in the same page.* And now, Sir, the public perhaps may think that the merit of the fraud, which you so kindly attempted to transfer to me, belonged solely to yourself. I, however, still hope better of you: and shall suppose it possible that you em-

* Institut. Chris. Pietatis. Parisiis, anno 1579.

ployed a mutilated edition of Canisius, or that, satisfied with the discovery of the abridged passage, you thought it unwise or unnecessary to make any further enquiry.

In the progress of your observations you express a wish to decide the controversy by reference to books of religious institution, printed about the commencement of the reformation. This at first sight may appear plausible: but the inutility of the attempt is evident from your confession that to obtain such books is difficult, if not impracticable.* After a long search I have, however, dis-

* I have discovered four English catechisms printed in 1730, 1702, 1649, 1639, all which contain the commandment. I have since met with the catechism published by John, Archbishop of St Andrews, "in his provincial council, with the advice of the bishops and other prelates, with doctors of theology and canon law present at the time, in 1551. - Printed at Sanct Androuis the xxix day of August the zeir of our Lord M. D. lii." From it I shall extract what regards the present subject.

Fol. xii. Thow sall haif na other Goddis bot me. Thow sall nocht mak to thee (as Gods) ony gravit ymage, nother ony similitude of ony thing that is in the heum above, or in ye erd beneth, nor of ony thing yat is in the watter under the erd. Thow sall nocht adorne yame nor worschip (as Goddis.)

Fol. xxi. Thai syn agane this command, that committis corporall ydolatrie, quhilk is, quhen men or wemen, nocht only giffis till certaine creaturis or thair ymages ye service of yair hartis, yat is to say, faith, hoip, and lufe, quhilk aucht to be geven to God, bot alsua yai gif to yame the outward service of thair body, as honour, worschip, and reverence, quhilk aucht to be gevin to God.

Fol. xxviii. Ar ymages aganis the first command. Na, sa thai be weil usit—Quhat is the rycht use of ymages? Imagis to

covered two, which though not written by catholics, are still worthy of notice. The first was the work of a gentleman "famous in his generation," and a particular favourite with the reformed writers, John Huss, *the father of the Bohemian religionists.*"* The second is a legacy bequeathed to us by no less a man than the great patriarch of the reformation, Martin Luther.† What was my surprise when in reading their editions of the commandment, I found that they had suppressed the prohibition in question: that they, the most ardent enemies of the Catholic doctrine, they whose whole study was to detect and expose the abominations of the Romish harlot, had not only not discovered the artifice of which she is now accused, but had themselves been guilty of it. Thanks to divine providence, I exclaimed, the apostles of orthodoxy at the present day, are not like those of past ages. If Huss and Luther

be made na haly writ forbiddis (sais venerabil Bede) for the sycht of thame specially of the crucifixe giffis greit compunction to thame quhilk beholdis it with faith in Christ, and to thame yat be unletterat, it giffis a quik remembrance of ye passion of Christ. Bot utterly yis command forbiddis to mak ymagis to that effect, that thai suld be adornit, and wirschippit as Goddis, or with ony Godly honour, ye quhilk sentence is expremitt be this wordis: non adorabis ea neque coles. Thow sall nocht adorne yame nor worschip thame as Goddis. Now we suld nocht gif Goddis honour or Christis honour to ony ymage bot to God allanerly, representit be ane ymage.

* Opera Huss. Norimbergæ, 1558, p. 30.

† Op. Luth. Ienæ, 1589, p. 117.

were blind, at least the Bishop of Durham and his clerical solicitor have their eyes open. The darkness, which deceived the fathers of the reformation, has been removed: a ray of evangelical light has burst from the cathedral of Durham; and the w—— of Babylon stands at last exposed in all her native deformity.*

The truth is, these innovators, as well as some Catholic writers, thought, that on particular occasions it was proper to make abridgments of the decalogue for the use of the dull and the ignorant. Of suppressing any commandment they neither had the wish nor the intention. Their conduct was the same as had been adopted by the holy spirit in different parts of the scriptures. Of these I shall notice only one. With the children of Israel the Lord made a covenant and charged them saying: “Ye shall not fear other Gods, nor bow yourselves to them, nor serve them, nor sacrifice to them.”† That this was meant as an abstract of

* See Dr Martin Luther's catechism, for Parsons, Schoolmasters, Masters of families, Young persons and children at school. “The ten commandments of God, which a master of a family ought exactly to represent to his domestics—The first commandment: Thou shalt have no other Gods besides me. Q. What is that? Ans. We must fear, love and trust God, above all things. “The second commandment: Thou shalt not use the name of thy God unprofitably. . . . The ninth commandment: Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house. The tenth commandment: “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, servant, maid, beast, or any thing that is his.” Appendix to Luther's German Bible, p. 25, Luneburg, 1640.

† 2 Kings xvii. 35.

what you call the first and second commandments, appears from the last verses of the chapter, in which they are said to have broken this covenant, and to have disregarded this charge by “ serving “ their graven images.” If then the suppression of the prohibition of images necessarily proceed from fraud, I fear the imputation must also be cast on God himself.

Of the relative merit of the two divisions of the decalogue adopted by Catholics and Protestants, I carefully avoided the discussion, that the subjects of controversy between us might not be unnecessarily multiplied. You, however, Sir, have forced it into notice, and that too in a manner which I cannot but characterize as unfair. You represent me as assigning the omission of the commandment in some small catechisms principally to our arrangement of the decalogue on the authority of St Augustine. If you look back to the Vindication, you will perhaps find your mistake. I mentioned, indeed, the authority of St Augustine, and I flattered myself that, as you could not accuse that father of idolatry, you would not assert that our division of the commandment was an artifice originally adopted to conceal our idolatry. Since, however, you are determined to discuss this question,* I beg your attention to the following observations.

* At the bottom of page 35, you mention a number of the fathers, who, you say, arrange the decalogue after your manner,

1. The scripture itself informs us that the decalogue contains ten commandments, but no where exhibits them actually divided. The prohibitory and precipient clauses amount in all to fourteen. It is therefore necessary to class some of them together, in order to reduce them to ten distinct precepts.

2. On this account it appears natural to unite together all such clauses as appertain to the same subject: and therefore Catholics consider as one commandment whatever regards the worship of false Gods. Protestants divide it into two: but with more reason they ought to divide it into three.

1. Though shalt have no other Gods before me. 2. Though shalt not make unto thee any graven image, &c. 3. Thou shalt not bow thyself to them, nor serve them. This conclusion, with the reason which is afterwards assigned, that God is a jealous God, and which equally applies to every clause, is a proof that in the eyes of the Jewish legislator, they formed but one commandment.

3. In scripture they are usually described as one commandment. This appears from the passages I have already quoted from *Exod. xx. 23.*—*2 Kings xvii. 35.* and also from *Lev. xix. 2.* and all those texts, in which to serve images and to serve

Nothing is more easy than to string together a collection of names, without referring to particular passages. Two of them I have consulted, and discovered that they follow, not your division, but the same as St Augustine. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom. l. vi.* and St Jerome, *Comment. in Ps. 32.*

other Gods is considered as the same crime, and of course as the violation of the same commandment.

4. In our arrangement of the decalogue, we divide the tenth precept of the church of England into two, for this obvious reason, that as the acts themselves are forbidden by two different commandments on account of their different natures, so the desires of these acts ought also to be forbidden by different precepts.—Thou shalt not commit adultery—thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife—thou shalt not steal—thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, &c.*

There is an old proverb not inapplicable to the present subject: "let not those throw stones whose eyes are made of glass." The accusation of suppressing the commandment comes with a bad grace from those, who cannot be ignorant how many unjustifiable liberties were taken with the scriptures by their predecessors. They mould-

* I may here be allowed to notice a mistake of yours, though it be of no great consequence. You say, that to make up the number of the commandments, we have removed one clause of the prohibition of evil concupiscence from the place it invariably holds in the bible, and have made of it a separate command. Now though it be true, that in Exodus the prohibition of coveting a neighbour's house comes before the prohibition of coveting his wife, yet in Deuteronomy it comes after: and if the Protestant church have a right to follow Exodus, the Catholic may claim a similar right to follow Deuteronomy. Indeed, in the old Greek translation the order in Exodus is the same as in Deuteronomy: and the best critics are agreed that it is the true order.

ed them into any shape that suited their interests, and persuaded their credulous disciples that they were reading the word of God, while in reality they were studying the inventions of men. I have my doubts, whether even the commandment in question has not received some improvement from their ingenuity. What claim has the word *image* to a place in the text? It certainly does not occur in the original: and by its introduction it limits the meaning of the precept. In the English version images and representations are indeed forbidden: but pillars of stone, the frequent objects of idolatrous worship to the ancient nations, are not included. It seems the first reformers had a great devotion to the word *image*: they inserted it in the sacred text wherever they pleased: and cared little whether it made sense or nonsense, provided it might furnish a quotation against the papists. But the passage which of all others was found the most useful, occurs 1 John v. 21: “Babes keep yourselves from *images*.” This version was made when the babes of the reformation were weak in faith, and it was proper to nourish their credulity with the milk of deception. The labour of their evangelical nurses was not lost. There was babe Knox in Scotland, whose enmity to images may still be read in the ruins of churches and monasteries: there was babe Whittingham at Durham, whose iconoclast piety pillaged the cathedral and filled his pockets: and there were your babes without number in all parts of the kingdom,

whose religion, like the barbarism of the Goths and Vandals, displayed itself in demolishing or defacing every monument of ancient piety. But these times are gone. The babes have grown up to manhood: their faith may now be fed with more solid food: and the images have disappeared from the text to make place for the true reading, *idols*.

With the charge of image-worship an incidental observation of the Bishop has connected the doctrines of the two churches on the subject of the eucharist. But I must take the liberty to inform you, Sir, that in discussing this topic you have wandered from the true point in question. If, as you insinuate, the Remarker has expressed himself obscurely, you will permit me to restate his meaning in clearer terms. The right reverend Prelate had asserted, that the Catholic tenet of the real presence is calculated to dispose men to worship the creature-image instead of the Creator. This observation appeared so ludicrous to the Remarker, that, disdaining to give a direct reply, he put a parallel case, which you must acknowledge to be exactly in point. He supposed an Unitarian to assert that the doctrine of the church of England concerning the divinity of Christ was also calculated to dispose men to worship the creature-image instead of the Creator. What reply his Lordship might make to this assertion, he did not venture to predict: but, whatever it might be, he pledged himself to shew, that it would as readily exonerate

the Catholics from the Bishop's accusation, as it could exonerate the Bishop from the accusation of the dissenter. I am inclined to think that you feel the force of the Remarker's observation. Like the other advocates of our right reverend adversary, you do not so much as attempt a reply to the argument put into the mouth of the Unitarian; but amuse yourself with endeavouring to shew that the real presence contradicts, while the divinity of Christ does not contradict, the evidence of the senses. On this, as it is foreign to the subject, I shall make no observation: but shall content myself with engaging to make good the Remarker's pledge, whenever any of his adversaries shall afford me an opportunity.

What I have hitherto said regards the Catholic doctrine respecting the Lord's supper: on that of the Church of England the only point between us is, whether it be sense or nonsense. The Remarker had given his verdict for the latter; and, Sir, notwithstanding the indignation with which you combat his opinion, I think that your own conduct affords a strong argument in his favour. Ten months ago you told us, that by the body and blood of Christ, which are received verily and indeed in the Lord's supper, is meant, not the body and blood, but the instrumental cause by which we are put in actual possession of all the graces, which Christ's crucified body can yield us:*

* First letter, p. 24.

meaning so very luminous, that I doubt not it has most forcibly stricken the mind of every child who has learnt the answer by heart. This is what your doctrine *was* : now let us see what it *is*. It would be too unpleasant a restraint on the liberty of the children of God, to confine them to the same belief for the whole year. Now you tell us, that the body and blood of Christ, which are received in very truth and deed, are a representation of the crucified Redeemer, which fully puts the receiver in possession of the title to that inheritance which Christ purchased for us with his blood.* This explication is equally perspicuous, and I trust that, during the next ten months, every child, who learns his catechism, will, by the grace of God (I am sure it can be by no other means) understand it in this manner. Whether at the expiration of that term, we shall be favoured with a third meaning, I cannot say : but you will, perhaps, agree with me, that a doctrine, which you yourself cannot explain twice in the same manner, is more akin to nonsense than sense.

Your attempt to vindicate the words of the catechism by a comparison, deserves the praise of ingenuity ; but proves, at the same time, how unable the greatest abilities are to impart even an appearance of reason to that which stands in direct contradiction to it. " Let us suppose," you say, " that a friend presents me with an estate, and

* Second letter, p. 41.

“ conveys to me my new possession by a written
 “ instrument. If I say, that in taking it into my
 “ hands, I verily and indeed receive the estate, I
 “ am not aware that I should deserve to be called
 “ a fool for my pains, and to be told that I talked
 “ nonsense.” No, Sir, I do not think you
 would : but have the goodness to observe, that in
 receiving the sacrament, you do not say that you
 receive the inheritance, which Christ has purchased
 for you, (that, indeed, though false, would make
 the comparison apposite) but you say that you re-
 ceive his body and blood, the very price with which
 he purchased the inheritance for you. Permit me
 then to improve your illustration. Were you, in
 taking the written instrument into your hand, to
 say, here I receive verily and indeed the body and
 blood of the friend who has given the estate, what
 impression do you think such words would make
 on the minds of those who heard you? Would
 they think you in your senses or not? Yet such
 is precisely the language of the church of England,
 which on one hand believes the body and blood
 of Christ not to be in the sacrament, and on the
 other believes them to be verily and indeed received
 in it. The evident absurdity of such a doc-
 trine is alone a sufficient proof of the politico-
 theological juggle to which I alluded in the Vin-
 dication.*

II. The second division of the Bishop's charge

* See Heylin, p. 203.

regarded the mediatorship of Christ, which he contended was violated by the Catholic practice of invoking the intercession of the saints. The arguments which have already been adduced to repel this accusation, are, in my opinion, so very satisfactory, that to repeat them here would, I conceive, be an insult to the judgment of my reader. I shall, therefore, omit them, and briefly notice such new matter as in your second letter you have occasionally introduced. 1. You begin by charging the Remarker with falsehood, and the Vindicator with an acknowledgment of his guilt. In the enjoyment of this imaginary victory you appear to feel so very comfortable, that it is not without reluctance I proceed to elucidate your mistake. Read a second time the observations of the Remarker, and you will not find in them the assertion that you seem to attribute to him. He never asserted that Catholics solicit the intercession of the saints with Christ *only*, but that they *only* solicit the intercession of the saints with Christ. The word *only* regards not Christ, but the act of solicitation. It did not exclude the other persons of the Trinity; it was meant merely to exclude the asking for grace and salvation from the saints. But I will repeat the passage as it stands in the Remarks. “ The Catholic, like the
 “ Protestant, expects salvation from the merits of
 “ Christ *only*; from the saints he asks neither
 “ grace nor salvation; he *only* solicits their

“ friendly intercession for him with Christ, who
 “ is his and their Saviour, his and their God.”

2. As to the prayer which you have transcribed from the rules of the sodality of the immaculate conception, I shall only reply, that I am totally unacquainted both with the rules and the sodality: that I have undertaken to defend the Catholic faith, not the pious extravagancies of any individual; and that even in the passage given in your letter, mention is made of the intercession of the Virgin Mary, and nothing is said to prove that it is independent of the mediatorship of Christ.

3. When to these words in a Catholic prayer, “ the weight of our own conduct presses us down,” you attribute this meaning, that “ we are so weighed down with the sense of our own unworthiness, that we dare not address our Blessed Saviour for mercy,” I can only congratulate you on your own ingenuity, and the importance of the discovery. Certain I am that such an idea never yet entered into the mind of any Catholic; and it must be a source of great satisfaction to us to find a Protestant clergyman employed in explaining to us the true meaning of our prayers.

In concluding this subject, I will ask what sense is to be attributed to these and similar passages in holy writ: “ I will bless thee and multiply thy seed for my servant Abraham’s sake.”* “ For

* Gen. xxvi. 24.

“ thy servant David’s *sake*, turn not away the face of thine anointed.”* Are they derogatory from the mediatorship of Christ? Or do they not shew that, in consideration of the zeal and fidelity of his departed servants, God may be sometimes induced to grant particular blessings to the living? To me it appears that they do; and this too without any derogation from the merits and mediatorship of Christ, because whatever favour the saints may possess with God, it is wholly founded on the merits and mediatorship of Christ.

On the subject of penance you state what you conceive to be our doctrine. Though your statement be inaccurate, I shall leave it to the judgment of the reader, whether it will authorize the inference you draw from it. Here you take occasion to condemn the Remarker of having misrepresented the Bishop’s charge. It is really a pity that you have not more accurately perused the book, which you have undertaken to refute. The Remarker observed, that he did not perfectly understand the meaning of the Right Reverend prelate; that according to Catholics, works of penance are one of the conditions on which Christ is willing to communicate the merits of his passion to the soul of the sinner; and that, *if* the bishop intended to condemn this doctrine, he encouraged

† Ps. cxxxii. 10.

the perpetration of sin, and invited men to think of repentance then only, when they could no longer gratify their passions. In this conclusion I must be allowed to say, that I still think the Remarker was correct.

When the Bishop of Durham had marshalled his arguments in three divisions, it required no small ingenuity to adapt the different subjects of discussion to the places allotted to them. How the with-holding of the sacramental cup from the laity could derogate from the mediatorship of Christ, it is not easy to conceive: but the objection was wanted to fill up the ranks; and by a slight alteration he has been enabled to arrange it in the same line with works of penance and the invocation of saints. It is not, indeed, said to be derogatory from the mediatorship of Christ: that was too manifestly false; but to be injurious to his honour, because it is a violation of his command. Let that, however, pass. In the Vindication, I had, in compliance with your request, adduced several instances of communion under one kind in the ancient church. Your answer is so very polite that it deserves notice. “I have,” you say, “taken the trouble of examining the different passages to which you refer; and I entreat the attention of my readers to an exposure of one of the most impudent and barefaced perversions of ancient writings that controversy even with papists can furnish.” Such language may,

perhaps, convince the unsuspecting or the uninformed reader, but

Ad populum phaleras : ego te intus et in cute novi.

Which of us has the better claim to the merit of perverting ancient testimony, the following observations may, perhaps, determine.

1. During the first four centuries of the christian æra, it was customary for the more fervent among the faithful to receive the sacrament daily in their own houses. Hence, when they communicated in public, they usually enclosed a larger portion of the consecrated bread in a small box, and carried it home with them. It was to refresh your memory as to this ancient custom, that I referred you, Sir, to the works of Tertullian and St Cyprian. There you may read different instances of it. Indeed, you yourself acknowledged that “ in Tertullian’s age the christians were *perhaps* “ accustomed to carry home with them part of the “ bread only and not of the wine from the Lord’s “ supper ; but,” you add “ to argue from it that “ they received the communion only in one kind “ is utterly ludicrous.” Now, Sir, I must confess that I have not sufficient sagacity to discover what there is so very ludicrous in this argument. When the faithful received the sacrament under the form of bread only in their houses, did they not communicate ? And if they did communicate, was it not in one kind only ? Whatever you may

think, I trust the reader will now agree with me, that in the age of Tertullian and Cyprian at least, communion under one kind was "partially admitted."

2. From the very commencement of christianity, to the reformation, it was customary to communicate the sick under one kind: and for this purpose a part of the consecrated bread was usually reserved in the church. I do not deny that there are instances of the communion being received by the sick in both kinds, particularly when it was administered immediately after the celebration of the liturgy: but I contend that the more usual method was to receive it under the form of bread only. Of the many proofs of this custom occurring in ancient writers, I was content with referring you to two. That from the life of St Ambrose you admit, but effect to be ignorant of the inference which may be deduced from it. That from Eusebius you attempt to disfigure, and observe with much gravity that "it is not said that the sick man did not also take the wine." This is true: but that the reader may see with how much reason the observation is introduced, I will relate the story to which I referred you in Eusebius. A dying man had sent to request that the priest would come and administer to him the sacrament. The priest, whose infirmities confined him to his house, "gave a small portion of the eucharist to the messenger, desiring him to moisten it, and put it in to the mouth of the dying man. He complied

“ with this request; the man communicated, and
 “ soon after expired.” Such is the account of
 Eusebius; and if from this account I infer, that
 the sick sometimes communicated under one kind,
 few of my readers will, I hope, accuse me of “ a
 “ most impudent and barefaced perversion of an-
 “ cient testimony.”

I also referred to the eleventh council of Toledo; and this council, even according to your own representation of it, is exactly in point. You tell us from it, that dying persons, “ who longed for the
 “ sacrament, often rejected the bread when
 “ brought, and could only swallow some of the
 “ cup.” If they swallowed some of the cup only, I presume they communicated in one kind only. But, you observe, “ of these it is not affirmed that
 “ they received the sacrament.” That is true: but why should it be affirmed? No one, I believe, ever doubted of it: and you yourself have forgotten to tell us, what it was they received when they received the consecrated cup, and yet did not receive the sacrament.

3. In the public churches the communion was almost always administered in both kinds: but each communicant was still left to his own choice to receive either both or one. This, I trust, I shall prove from the passage in St Leo, to which I referred you. “ It is plain,” you say, “ from the
 “ whole passage, that the cup was always offered,
 “ that certain heretics declined to take it; and
 “ that, for their refusal, they were most strongly

“condemned by Pope Leo. Yet this is unblush-
 “ingly adduced to prove that communion under
 “one kind was always partially admitted.” Such,
 Sir, is your comment: now have the patience to
 hear mine. It appears from Pope Leo, that the
 Manichæans at Rome wished to escape the obser-
 vation of the public. With this view (*quo tutius*
laterent) they assisted with the christians at the
 sacred mysteries, and communicated together with
 them. Now, Sir, how could they have avoided
 detection, had their method of communicating
 been different from that of others? The very at-
 tempt would have exposed them. It is evident,
 then, they communicated like others. Yet we
 know that they communicated in one kind only,
 because their religion taught wine to be the crea-
 ture of the evil principle. May I not then justly
 infer, that many among the christians were accus-
 tomed to communicate in the same manner?

Now, Sir, permit me to ask, where is “the
 “impudent and barefaced perversion of the tes-
 “timony of ancient writings,” of which you com-
 plain? Have I not shewn that to receive one
 kind only was customary, 1. in private commu-
 nion, 2. in the communion of the sick, and 3.
 even in public communion? And is not this
 sufficient to prove, what had been previously as-
 serted, that communion in one kind had always
 been partially admitted? I might, had I pleased,
 have alledged other passages, and have instanced
 the *Missæ Præsantificatorum* in both the Greek

and Latin churches ; but those which you consider as so barefaced a perversion of ancient testimony, will, I do not doubt, be sufficient to convince the mind of every dispassionate reader.

May I also be allowed to ask, what is the meaning of these words ; “ one of the most impudent “ and barefaced perversions of the testimony of “ ancient writings, *that controversy even with “ papists can furnish ?*” Do you wish it to be believed that Catholic writers are particularly addicted to the arts of misrepresentation and perversion of ancient testimony ? If you do, I deny the charge, and hurl it back with contempt in the teeth of our immaculate accusers. The man who employs misrepresentation, who perverts the testimony of ancient writers, must be conscious of the falsehood of his creed : and I trust that the conduct of the catholics, during two centuries of privations, penalties, and persecutions, must have proved, to the most incredulous observer, that we are convinced of the truth of ours. Had, indeed, the Catholic faith been the road to opulence and preferment, were rich and easy livings offered as rewards to the exertions of its champions, were its ministers accustomed to calculate the amount of the tithes as well as of the articles of religion, and to subscribe *ex animo* to that which they must confess to be doubtful, and which many of them do not, in fact, believe ; then, indeed, we might have motives to use misrepresentation and perversion in the defence of our creed. Had it led

us into a land flowing with milk and honey, the advantages of our situation might have induced us to employ artifice and cunning to retain it. But with every temporal motive to make us wish our faith to be false, we shall be fools indeed, if we adhere to it, and defend it, when we know it not to be true. Nothing but a sense of duty can teach us to prefer the barrenness of the desert to the onions and flesh-pots of Egypt. But, Sir, were you aware how easily the reproach might have been retorted on yourself, and your brethren in arms? Were I disposed to retaliate, I might call to your recollection the scandal of past ages; I might paint to the eyes of the public, the artifices, misrepresentations, and falsehoods adopted by your predecessors in the office of calumniating the Catholic church; I might refer you to an eminent writer of the present day, who declares, that forgery was the vice of the reformation; or to the celebrated Protestant professor Zanchius, who thus complains of his reforming colleagues: “ I
 “ am indignant, when I consider the manner in
 “ which most of us defend our cause. The true
 “ state of the question we often, on set purpose,
 “ involve in darkness, that it may not be under-
 “ stood: we have the impudence to deny things
 “ the most evident: we assert what is visibly
 “ false: the most impious doctrines we force on
 “ the people as the first principles of faith, and
 “ orthodox opinions we condemn as hereti-
 “ cal: we torture the scriptures till they agree

“ with our own fancies ; and boast of being the
 “ disciples of the fathers, while we refuse to
 “ follow their doctrine : to deceive, to calum-
 “ niate, to abuse, is our familiar practice : nor
 “ do we care for any thing, provided we can de-
 “ fend our cause, good or bad, right or wrong.
 “ O what times ! what manners.”* Certainly
 those, whose guilt is thus confessed by their own
 writers, should be careful how they throw out insi-
 nuations against the honesty of others.

In the Vindication I had mentioned an autho-
 rity, to which I conceived a clergyman of the
 Church of England would bow with profound re-
 spect ; an act of parliament, which allowed the
 sacrament to be sometimes given in one kind on-
 ly. That in theory the faith which you profess
 is founded on scripture, may or may not be true :
 that in practice it is founded on the authority of
 parliament, will not be denied. Acts of parlia-
 ment alone can make articles of faith, and acts of
 parliament alone can declare any doctrine here-
 tical. Whether or not the kingdom of Christ be
 of this world, it is evident that the Church of
 England is. Now, Sir, what answer do you make
 to this authority ? That the question is not about
 the notions of the first reformers, but about the
 present doctrine of your church. Be it so. Has
 the act to which I allude ever been repealed ?
 And, if it has not, does it not still remain in

* Zanchius ad Stormium, tom. viii. col. 828.

force? I believe that this question must be answered in the affirmative: whence it will follow, either, that to give the communion in one kind is “not a violation of the divine command, a mutilation of the sacrament,” or that the Church of England is involved in the same guilt with her mother the Romish harlot, and must like her bare her shoulders to the episcopal scourge.

You ask, whether our Saviour’s precepts were *not* of general obligation? To so indefinite a question I beg leave to answer, by asking in my turn, whether the precept of consecrating the eucharist, *was* of general obligation? Both of us, I believe, must answer alike, that some precepts were addressed to particular classes, some to the whole body of christians.

On my assertion, that the scripture no where mentions the liquor contained in the Lord’s cup to have been wine, you make, with much solemnity, the following erudite observation: “This assertion shews such ignorance of the gospel as might amaze me more than it does, did I not remember of what church you are a member. Read Matt. xvi. 29, Luke xxii. 18, and blush for so egregious a blunder.” The reader shall soon determine which of us has the more the reason to blush.

It is now some years since I was first acquainted with the two passages to which you have so politely sent me, and I have yet to learn that they have any reference whatever to the present subject. “I

“ will not drink of this fruit of the vine, till the
 “ kingdom of God come, or till I drink it new
 “ with you in my Father’s kingdom.” Now, Sir,
 do these words refer to the liquor contained in the
 eucharistic cup, or to the liquor which had been
 drunk during the repast? St Matthew, indeed,
 favours the former exposition: but if you atten-
 tively peruse the account of St Luke, who has
 more minutely detailed the particulars of our
 Lord’s last supper, you will, perhaps, think with
 me, that the latter is the true meaning. Jesus and
 his disciples first ate the passover, when he said to
 them, “ I will not any more eat thereof until it be
 “ fulfilled in the kingdom of God.” They then
 all drank of the cup, when he said, “ I will not
 “ drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom
 “ of God shall come.” Each of these passages,
 the first spoken after he had eaten, the second af-
 ter he had drunk, were predictions of his ap-
 proaching passion. As the first referred, not to
 the eucharistic bread, but to the passover, so the
 second referred, not to the eucharistic cup, but to
 the wine drank with the passover. The eucharist
 had not yet been instituted. Its institution follow-
 ed immediately after. But neither in St Luke, nor
 in any other part of the scripture, is it said, that
 the liquor which was consecrated by our Redeemer
 was wine. I do not mean to deny that it was.
 All I wish to prove is, that neither the scripture
 nor any act of parliament has yet defined wine to
 be the matter of the sacrament; and thence to in-

fer, that since for the matter you are content to rest on the authority of the Catholic church, you may with equal security rest upon the same authority for the manner also.

III. The Romans were accustomed to place in the third line the Triarii, soldiers of tried and approved valour. They formed the strength of the army, the best hope of the general. But our episcopal field-marshal has studied tactics in a different school. His third line is formed after the levy-en-masse act. His troops are a confused medley of all ages, sizes, and conditions.* We have good works, and indulgences, and pardons, and unknown tongues, and the scriptures, and translations, and editions of the Greek testament, and Protestant universities, all embodied to defend the “sanctifying influences of the holy spirit,” and to precipitate the downfall of the Romish Babylon.

A motley crew, with ever varying face,
Devoid of spirit, order, strength and grace;
Such as old Falstaff led, or such as might
Have sought the banners of La Mancha's knight.

To this numerous host of objections the Remarker was content to oppose one very easy and obvious question. He asked whether any of our adversaries can point out a Catholic congregation, whose morals are in any respect inferior to those of their Protestant neighbours. Facts are decisive, when reasoning only creates obscurity. The tree is to be known by its fruits: and unless Ca-

tholics by the inferiority of their morals prove the accusation to be true, it is useless to argue that their practices are derogatory from the influences of the Holy Spirit. The question has been repeatedly put to all the champions of the Bishop; and experience has shewn that it is impossible to goad them to an answer. Even you, Sir, have shrunk from the attempt. The imputation of dishonesty and misrepresentation, which you have cast on the Remarker, on myself, and on Catholic writers in general, shews, that if you have been silent, it was because you could not return an unfavourable answer. I shall, therefore, assume, from the tacit confession of our adversaries, that Catholics have no reason to yield the palm of virtue to Protestants: and shall thence conclude, that their practices are not more inimical to the influences of the Holy Spirit, than the practices, or rather the non-practices, of their Protestant brethren. That man has yet to learn to blush, who, with such a fact staring him in the face, can still come forward, and repeat the accusation.

The Bishop had forgotten to press the rosary into his service. You have supplied the omission, and tell us, that “as the vulgar could not read, it
 “ was also determined they should not understand
 “ what they were to repeat. Instead therefore of
 “ giving them any prayers in a language of their
 “ own, which they might get by heart, you were
 “ pleased to accommodate them with a string of
 “ words to be repeated one hundred and fifty

“ times over, though as unintelligible to them as “ the merest gibberish.” Honest and worthy clerk, have you then the simplicity to believe, that Catholics, who are unable to read, are yet able to say their prayers in a foreign tongue ; the Latin, I imagine ? Do have the goodness to inform the public by what ingenious contrivance we accommodate those, who cannot read, with strings of Latin words. Your discovery certainly deserves, and will, I trust, obtain a premium from the society for the encouragement of the arts and sciences.

But they are not only our practices, even the value which we ascribe to them is adduced as a proof of the Bishop’s accusation. Here, Sir, I may be allowed to say, that I cannot admire either your prudence or that of our right reverend adversary. Whoever impartially estimates the respective doctrines of the two churches, must, I think, confess that ours is favourable, yours unfavourable to the influences of the Holy Spirit. You teach, that man is justified by faith only ; a tenet which the thirty-nine articles feelingly pronounce to be “ most wholesome and full of comfort.”* This solifidian doctrine was the crea-

* Is it not rather singular that a church, which pretends to be built on scripture alone, should so form the articles of her belief as to be in direct contradiction to the very words of scripture ? *We are justified by faith only*, says the eleventh article. *A man is not justified by faith only*, says St James, ii. 24. Heylin is said to have been so ashamed of the word *only*, that he omitted it in his edition of the articles. Hist. p. 354,

ture of Luther's policy: and it served him most effectually. To it the reformation was in a great measure indebted for its establishment. It was not, indeed, very consonant to reason; but it wanted not the support of reason: every passion that has a seat in the human breast, pleaded in its favour. The old-fashioned apostles of christianity had taught that there were many crimes, which excluded from the kingdom of God: the new apostle with "his everlasting gospel," restrained the power of damning to infidelity alone.* They, unacquainted with the true nature of christian liberty, had still left us several duties to perform: he, with his usual magnanimity, freed us from them at once. "Faith alone," he cried, "is necessary for our justification: nothing else is either commanded or prohibited." "Say not that God will punish sin. The law, indeed, says so. But what have I to do with the law? I am free."† They had exhorted their disciples to perform good works, and thus make their calling and election sure: he, kind soul! preached a more easy and consoling doctrine. "The way to heaven is narrow," he exclaimed, "throw away

* Ubi fides est, nullum peccatum nocere potest. In Serm. Sic Deus dilexit—Nulla peccata damnare possunt, nisi sola incredulitas. De Captiv. Bab. cap. de Baptismo.

† Sola fides necessaria est ut justi simus, cætera omnia liberri-
ma, neque præcepta amplius, neque prohibita.—Ergo Deus puniet et damnabit? Non. At lex hoc dicit. Sed nihil mihi cum lege.—Quare? Quia habeo libertatem. Cap. 2, ad Gal.

“ your good works, if you wish to squeeze through
 “ it.”* Who could refuse to listen to so inviting
 a teacher ! Under his guidance, who but a fool
 could escape the possession of eternal happiness !

Though our lean faith such rigid laws has giv'n,
 The full-fed Musselman goes fat to heav'n :
 For his Arabian prophet with delights
 Of sense allured his eastern proselytes,
 The jolly Luther leading him, began
 To interpret scriptures by *his* alcoran ;
 To grub the thorns beneath our tender feet,
 And make the paths of paradise more sweet ;
 Bethought him of a wife e'er half-way gone,
 (For 'twas uneasy travelling alone)
 And in this masquerade of mirth and love,
 Mistook the bliss of heav'n for Bacchanals above.

A doctrine of this description was not likely to be
 very favourable to the influences of the holy spi-
 rit. If it reformed the creed, it deformed the
 morals of its professors. This is a truth acknow-
 ledged and lamented by the evangelical preachers
 themselves. “ Formerly,” says Luther, “ when
 “ we were seduced by the Pope, every one wil-
 “ lingly followed good works ; but now people
 “ neither say nor know any thing but how to get
 “ all to themselves by exaction, pillage, theft,

* *Angusta est via ; oportet te fieri tenuem si vis per eam venire*
—Si veneris cum magnis saccis operum plenis, deponere oportebit,
alioqui non poteris penetrare. Serm. de novo test.

“ falsehood, usury, &c.”* “ Of the thousands,” says Calvin, “ who renounced popery, and seemed eagerly to embrace the gospel, how few have amended their lives? Indeed, what else did the greater part pretend to, than by shaking off the yoke of superstition to give themselves more liberty, and to plunge into every kind of lasciviousness.”† “ The greater part of the people,” adds Bucer, “ seem to have embraced the gospel, only to live at their pleasure, and enjoy their lusts and lawless appetites without controul. Hence they lend a willing ear to the doctrine, *that we are justified by faith only, and not by good works*, for which they have no relish.”‡

Now, Sir, this doctrine, the prolific parent of so much immorality, you have adopted. It holds a distinguished place among the thirty-nine articles, the new gospel framed by the founders of your church. How much it favours the influences of the holy spirit, we have already seen: and I am astonished that any man who has subscribed to such an opinion, should dare to accuse the opinions of others as inimical to the influences of the holy spirit. I do not mean to assert, that at the present day it has effects equally pernicious on the morals of the Protestants. They (in this re-

* Luth. in Serm. dom. 26 post Pent.

† Calv. i. vi. de Scand.

‡ Buc. de Regn. Christ. l. i. c. 4.

spect happily for themselves) are little acquainted with the doctrines of their church. To know that the Pope is antichrist, and the Roman church the whore of Babylon, is theology enough to form an orthodox churchman. Even you yourselves, (I mean the teachers in Israel) have learned to blush at the extravagance of this solifidian doctrine, and by the aid of ingenious and subtle distinctions, have endeavoured to expound it in a sense more agreeable to reason, and less dangerous to morality. Nor do I blame you. Those who give the poison, should administer the antidote; and as every candidate for holy orders is compelled to swallow the draught, I shall not complain if its more bitter ingredients be dulcified by explanations, or if by any contrivance it be made pleasant to the palate, and safe to the constitution.

But to return to the Catholic church. The Bishop of Durham condemns "our presumptuous doctrine respecting the merit of good works." That the right reverend prelate conceived he had just ground for this censure, I have no doubt; but how it can be "injurious to the sanctifying influence of the holy spirit," to ascribe merit to works performed by the sanctifying influence of that spirit, is what neither I, nor, I suspect, any rational being can comprehend.

You, Sir, are the official defender of the prelate, and in your second letter have displayed no small industry in your attempt to justify his censure. The exposition of the Catholic doctrine

which I gave in the Vindication, you have indeed honoured with your approbation: but still you have recourse to your favourite artifice; you fly to the works of the ancient schoolmen; you read us a long lecture on merit of congruity and merit of condignity: and after repeating a string of harsh, crabbed, scholastic phrases, presume you have convinced, because you have fatigued, the understanding of the reader.

From my explication, you appeal to the authority of the council of Trent. Listen then to that council. “To those who persevere in good works to the end, and trust in God, eternal life is to be proposed, both as a grace mercifully promised to the sons of God through Jesus Christ, and as a reward which, according to the promise of God, will be faithfully rendered to their good works and merits.”*

But you object to “the happy ambiguity of language” in which the decrees of the council are expressed. Hence, Sir, I may be allowed to doubt whether you yourself believe the doctrine of the council to be favourable to your opinion. The only ambiguity in its language consists in this, that it confined itself to what was strictly of faith, and left the different opinions of divines just as it found them. In this I see much to praise, and nothing to reprehend. You must not persuade yourself, Sir, that a Catholic council

* Sess. vi. c. ult.

possesses either the omnipotence or infallibility of an English parliament. It cannot make articles of faith, as suits its policy or convenience. It can only define what it has received from its predecessors as essential to our faith. These doctrines no Catholic will deny: in all other subjects they are perfectly free; and their freedom the council was careful not to invade. Such was the origin of that cautious language which you have been pleased to condemn as ambiguous.

But, Sir, instead of adverting to the language of the council, is there nothing ambiguous in the language employed by the Bishop and yourself? You frequently disapprove of our doctrine, yet seldom condescend to inform us what that doctrine is. Though I have read with much attention all your strictures on the subject of good works, I have still to learn what sentiments you really attribute to us. To me it appears (but this is no better than conjecture) that you conceive us to teach good works to be *of their own nature* meritorious of eternal life. But this, if it be so, is an egregious mistake. It was the doctrine of Baius, and condemned by Pius V. All Catholic divines unite in considering it as heretical.

Perhaps it may not be amiss to inform you, that when the schoolmen speak of the merit of good works, they ascribe that merit not to the efforts of man, but to the grace of God. Man, they teach, by his own natural powers can merit nothing more than a reward proportionate to his own nature:

but if he be aided by supernatural grace, that supernatural grace may render him worthy of a supernatural reward. This important distinction you have, probably from your late acquaintance with Catholic theology, entirely overlooked : but if you will bear it in mind, and peruse a second time the works of Soto, and Bellarmine, and Vasquez, your candour will acknowledge that you have misunderstood their meaning, and that their real doctrine is not injurious, but highly honourable to “ the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit.”

I am surprised that in reading Bellarmine you did not observe with what hesitation he speaks of his own doctrine. He says he thinks it probable. Had he considered it as the Catholic doctrine, you know that he would have employed a very different language, and have pronounced it certain. He undertakes to refute the opinion of Soto. Yet you refer your reader to both, as faithful expositors of our creed. Would you then compel us to believe one thing as certain on the authority of Soto, and the contrary as certain on the authority of Bellarmine. This would be, indeed, to tyrannize over our intellects.

You tell us that the zeal of Vasquez carried him far beyond the limits to which the moderation of Soto and Bellarmine had confined them. May I, Sir, refer you to the following passage from the works of Vasquez, which, I trust, will justify him in the opinion of my readers, and shew that his

sentiments on this subject were not very different from mine.

“ I do not, says he, attribute to God the obligation of rewarding good works in *justice*; as if he were bound to recompence us for the good works which he receives from us: but I confine it entirely to his *promise* and his fidelity to his engagements. Hence were he not to reward them with eternal life, he could not properly be said to be unjust: but he might be said to be unfaithful, because he would violate his own word.”*

In conclusion you desire me to say, whether you have mistated the doctrine of the Catholic church on this important point.” I answer without hesitation that you have. You have ascribed to the Catholic church the doctrine of the schoolmen: and their doctrine you have stated unfairly. Nor say that they misunderstood the language of the council of Trent. The subjects which they discussed were subjects that the council overlooked, because they did not appertain to the substance of faith. On them every Catholic exercises his own judgment, and admits or rejects the opinions of divines as he pleases.

On indulgences you favour us with nothing that is new, except the authority of Corio, and the condemned propositions of Luther. May I ask from what edition of Corio you quote? That of Milan

* Vasquez, disp. 215.

in folio, 1503, is genuine: those that followed were interpolated by the editors. However that may be, the information which you have procured from him, is undoubtedly curious. That Boniface the eighth swayed the papal sceptre with a stubborn hand, was known to most of your readers: but that he continued to exercise the pontifical authority eighty years after his death, is a fact, for our acquaintance with which we are indebted to you. He died in 1303, and yet, according to your Corio, granted an indulgence to the inhabitants of Milan in 1391. Without discrediting your authority, I beg leave to observe, that our dispute regards indulgences granted, not by dead, but by living popes.

It is, indeed, true that Boniface the ninth granted to the churches in Milan the same indulgences as were granted during the jubilee in Rome. But these expressly required contrition and confession as previous conditions. Corio, therefore, has either been corrupted, or he has contradicted himself.*

As to Luther's propositions, condemned by Leo X. have the goodness to peruse a second time the bull of that pontiff, and you will perhaps learn, that they were not all condemned as heretical, but some because he had pronounced them to be arti-

* Nella medesima forma, ch'era a Roma. Corio.—Vere pœnitentibus et confessis. Bulla Jubil. in Bullario Magno Tom. 1. p. 204.

cles of Catholic faith, which they were not; and others, because they were preached by that innovator to excite disrespect towards the apostolic see.

From indulgences I shall pass to the charge of locking up the scriptures from the knowledge of the laity. I had observed that this charge rested entirely on the regulations of the Index: and that these regulations were only temporary, and confined to certain places. I may add, that the Index did not lock up the scriptures from the knowledge of the laity, even at the time and in the places in which it was received. It only prohibited the versions in the vulgar languages. The originals, with the ancient translations, were still open to the perusal of the laity: and it is well known that in Catholic countries, there are in every rank of life, thousands to whom the Latin language at least is familiar. Nor were the scriptures, in the vulgar tongues, withheld from the more ignorant. They might still obtain permission to read them. The prohibition was only designed to prevent those extravagancies to which the promiscuous reading of the sacred volumes had given birth in Protestant countries, and which caused the learned editor of the Polyglot to observe, that the reformers, by putting the scriptures into the hands of the vulgar, had opened the mouth of the bottomless pit. Indeed I know not whether there would be any harm, if something like the regulations of the Index were adopted in England at the present day. We

should not then hear of so many tinkers, cobblers, postboys, and men in the lowest walks of life, obtaining licences to preach, or rather to abuse the gospel.

I had requested that those, who thus accuse us of locking up the scriptures, would prove their accusation, “ by reference to the decree of some “ council, or the bull of some pope, or the statute “ of some provincial synod, or the order of some “ bishop.” This task you cheerfully undertake: and then without blushing send me back to the Index, as if I had not previously refuted the objection. You next refer me to three propositions censured by a bull of Clement XI. Are you acquainted with the real nature of this censure? The propositions were condemned for insinuating a falsehood. They were intended by their authors to convey the same accusation against the Catholics, as has been advanced by the Bishop of Durham. For this reason they were pronounced to be injurious and calumnious to the church.

Thus have I arrived at your last page, in which you say you have done with me, most probably for ever. I have no objection. It is time this controversy should be ended. If in the course of it I have ever employed a harsh expression, an unseemly epithet, your candour, I am sure, will excuse me. It was from you I learned such language. You have so profusely scattered these beauties through your pages, that they may have occasionally found their way into mine. One good at least,

I trust, will arise from the discussion, that our future adversaries will attempt to refute the doctrines which we really hold, instead of accusing us of such as we reject : that we shall hear no more of these charges, which

Halting on crutches of unequal size,
 One leg by truth supported, one by lies,
 Thus sidle to the goal with awkward pace,
 Secure of nothing but to lose the race.

F I N I S.

REMARKS

ON

A LATE PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED,

“ THE GROUNDS, ON WHICH THE CHURCH OF
ENGLAND SEPARATED FROM THE CHURCH
OF ROME, RECONSIDERED.

By Shute, Bishop of Durham.”

BY THE AUTHOR

OF THE

“ Remarks on the Bishop of Durham’s Charge.”

Πειθόμεθα τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ μηδὲν ἀντιλεγόμεν, καὶ ἐναντίως
εἶναι δοκῇ τοῖς ἡμετέροις λογισμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὄψεσι τοῦ λεγο-
μένου· ὁ μὲν γὰρ λόγος αὐτῶ ἀπαράλογιτος· ἡ δὲ αἰσθησις
ἡμῶν εὐεξαπατητός. Ἐπεὶ ἔν ὁ λόγος φησὶ, ταῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ
σῶμα μὲν, καὶ πειθόμεθα καὶ πιστεύομεν.

Χρυσοστῶ. ὁμ. πῶ. εἰς Ματ.

REMARKS
ON
THE INTRODUCTORY LETTER

TO

THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF DURHAM.

NO minister of the God of peace has ever attempted to disseminate religious discord, who did not feel, or affect to feel, himself actuated by the most holy and edifying motives. In controversy, as in war, the aggressor is always eager to justify the aggression. It is not the lust of power, the thirst for preferment, the desire of revenge, or any earthly consideration, that urges him to the attack: the faith which he has bound himself to defend is in danger: an imperious necessity compels him to detect the artifices and expose the sophistry of its enemies. Thus is religion, the best gift of God to man, frequently identified with the worst passions of the human breast.

This observation does not, cannot, apply to the

Bishop of Durham. The benevolence of that prelate's character is a sufficient guarantee for the uprightness of his intentions. He was indeed the aggressor in this controversy. He began by preaching a crusade against the opinions of his Catholic brethren, and then declared that the war, which he waged, should be an eternal war, a *bellum usque ad internecionem*.* He first pronounced us enemies to the honour of God the Father, to the mediatorship of God the Son, and to the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit;† and afterwards condemned us of the guilt of idolatry, of blasphemy, and of sacrilege.‡ But, though these were grievous charges, no one doubted that the right reverend Prelate was impelled by motives which would justify his conduct. What these motives were, indeed, we knew not; but we gave him credit for them.

The Bishop, however, in his Introductory Letter, has thought proper to enter into an explanation; and that explanation has disclosed a motive, for which the Catholics will be grateful. "There is," he says, "some danger, lest, under a miscon-
 "strued indulgence to the popish petitions, we
 "should, by an appearance of indifference to our
 "own church, give countenance to doctrines and
 "usages, which, as sincere Protestants, and
 "readers of our Bible, we must ever hold to be

* The Grounds, &c. by Shute, Bishop of Durham, p. 9.

† Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, p. 5.

‡ The Grounds, &c. p. 8.

“ idolatrous, blasphemous, and sacrilegious.”* Some readers of the Bible, perhaps, may wonder what religious doctrines can have to do with petitions for political privileges; “ what concord “ there can be between Christ and Belial.” But, not to press this subject here, I may ask, when the Bishop of Durham gave to the Catholic petitions any indulgence that could be misconstrued? He has uniformly opposed them. I conceive, therefore, that his words cannot refer to the past, but must allude to his future conduct. They imply a promise of future support to the Catholic petitions, and an anxiety lest this alteration in his political, should be taken for an alteration in his religious, sentiments. For this he certainly deserves our thanks. We shall willingly purchase the enmity of his pen, for the favour of his vote. Let him as a legislator support our cause, and he shall be at liberty as a writer to condemn our doctrines. His censure can do them little injury: his vote may contribute to break the chains of our political thralldom.

I do not, however, see, how to support the Catholic petitions can be construed to betray an indifference to the Church of England. I think it shews a strict adherence to the great principle on which the Church of England was founded. That principle was the right of private judgment: the obligation which binds every man to search the

* Ibid.

scriptures, and to embrace every doctrine which he discovers in them. But, if I have an equal right with you to judge for myself, what right have you to punish me for dissenting from you? If I believe Christ to be really present in the eucharist, and you believe him to be present by faith only, what is there in my opinion that should incapacitate me, or in yours that should qualify you, for civil employment? For our religious opinions we are answerable to God alone: “who art thou that judgest,” or rather punishest, “another man’s servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth.”

With much orthodox charity, the Bishop proceeds to lock the gates of Paradise against the great majority of the christian world. As if Christ had died for the insular Church of England alone, he boldly pronounces, that hardly any one, who professes the same doctrine with the Church of Rome, can reasonably hope to enjoy the benefit of our common redemption.* In this view of the case, the fate of the English Catholics is peculiarly severe. Our conscientious adherence to what we conceive to be the doctrine of Christ excludes us from the privileges of our birthright here, and the same will exclude us from the joys of heaven hereafter. All the good things, both of this world and of the next, appear to be reserved for the professors of the established creed. In the gospel originally preached by our blessed Lord, if the

* The Grounds, &c. p. 8.

poor man was refused the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table in this life, in that to come he might expect to be raised to an equality at least with his proud oppressor: in the new gospel of the Bishop of Durham, we are not only refused all share of the crumbs now, but are condemned to remain in a similar state of degradation for ever hereafter.

But it was not only the fear of appearing indifferent to the Church of England that prompted the Bishop to publish his last pamphlet: he informs us that he was urged by another, and, perhaps, more efficacious, motive: he wished to chastise the insolence of the Remarker, who had applied the opprobrious term of *points at issue* to the subjects discussed in the Bishop's charge.* If this be a crime of high treason against the established creed, I must plead guilty; though the words were certainly employed without the remotest idea of giving offence to the orthodox feelings of my adversary. The reader, however, may possibly be at a loss to conceive in what the offence consists. The right reverend Prelate shall inform him. These doctrines are not *points at issue*, he exclaims, they have been decided long ago.† Decided long ago! Had such an assertion fallen from a Catholic writer, I should not have been surprised. He indeed believes that they were decided long ago, many centuries before the birth

* Ibid. p. 9.

† Ibid.

of the present Church of England. But that a Protestant prelate, whose creed is the offspring of private judgment, should thus attempt to check the freedom of religious inquiry, this, indeed, does excite my astonishment. But how have these subjects been decided? “By the establishment of the Protestant church,” is his answer.* This is still more singular. Were I to draw a parallel between the establishment of the Protestant church, and the miraculous diffusion of christianity in the first centuries, the reader would see with what reason the former might be adduced as an argument in favour of its creed. There was, as I have before had occasion to observe, too much of human policy and human passion, too much of intrigue, sacrilege, and impiety, in the establishment of that church, to make it a test of the religion of the God of all holiness. As well might the disciple of Mahomet adduce the establishment of the Koran in proof of the divine mission of his prophet.

As, however, the right reverend Prelate proceeded in his pamphlet, he made a new discovery, and found that the decision of these subjects rested, not, as he had before taught, on the establishment of the Protestant church, but on the authority of an infallible tribunal, composed of Luther and Melancthon, of Whitaker and Jewell, of Chillingworth, Wake, and Stillingfleet.† This too is

* The Grounds, &c. p. 9.

† Ibid, p. 25.

strange, passing strange. Does then the learned Prelate think that I cannot also produce, on my side of the question, a list of names equally illustrious? Has he forgotten, or is he ignorant, that to these champions of protestantism was opposed a phalanx of writers every way their equals in learning, abilities, and judgment? But, if authority be the weapon with which we are to contend, I shall not be satisfied with the decisions of a few individuals: I shall confidently appeal to the consent of the great body of christians; and not only of those churches which are in communion with the church of Rome, but also to the Oriental churches, which, for more than ten centuries, have been separated from her. And with such a mass of authority in my favour, am I to be scared with the names of Luther and Melancthon, of Whitaker and Jewell, of Chillingworth, Wake, and Stillingfleet?

But I am surprised that the Bishop, in summing up his authorities, should have omitted one far more formidable than any which he has mentioned; the authority of that illustrious doctor under whom Luther studied his theology. I shall endeavour to supply the omission: and, reader, if thou feel disposed to doubt the truth of the narrative, remember that I do no more than transcribe the words of the “magnanimous parent of the reformation.” He committed it to writing for the benefit and edification of his disciples: and I have often wondered why no orthodox clergyman has

ever drawn it from the obscurity of the language in which it is concealed, and published it in an English version, that the unlearned might enjoy the happiness of reading the new gospel in their native tongue. The fact, as related by Luther, is this. One night, just as the clock struck twelve, Satan tapped him on the shoulder as he lay in his bed,* and with a deep hollow voice addressed him as follows:—"Hark ye, right learned Doctor
 " Martin, do not you know, that, for these last
 " fifteen years, you have been in the daily habit
 " of saying private masses? Now, what if all
 " this while you have been daily committing acts
 " of idolatry; and, instead of the body and blood
 " of Christ, have adored, and exhibited to others
 " to adore, nothing but bread and wine?" To this serious question, the father of the reformation

* As Luther did not choose, I am unable to inform the reader of the name or rank of this controversial devil. The German apostle, however, appears to have received frequent visits from the inhabitants of the infernal regions. Some of them, he informs us, were malicious devils, who cracked his nuts, and rolled empty barrels down stairs while he slept. Others were good-natured devils, who attended him in his walks by day, and went to bed with him at night. But there were two, whom he so admired for their abilities and erudition, that he declared "they could not
 " be every-day devils: they were marvellous devils, probably
 " doctors of divinity in the universities below." *Non vulgares sed magni dæmones, imo doctores theologiæ inter diabolos.* (Colloq. Mensal. Germ. edit. fol. 275. See the whole of that strange work.) And it is on the authority of this madman, that the Bishop of Durham would have me believe that the points in discussion between the two churches have been decided!!!

very learnedly replied—" I am a priest, I was ordained by a true bishop, I acted according to the commands of my superiors; why then should I not be said to have truly consecrated, as I pronounced the words diligently, and said the masses devoutly?" To convince him of his error, Satan adduced six very cogent arguments, which went to prove that he was not a priest, and of course had not the power of consecrating. Luther felt their force, and could only murmur, that he had acted in the name of the church, and that if he had not any true faith himself, at least the church had. " Nonsense!" exclaimed Satan: " tell me where it is written, that a sinner and an infidel can consecrate the body and blood of Christ."* But it cannot be necessary that I should relate the whole of this very edifying discussion. Suffice it to say, that Luther was at last convinced, by the reasoning of his infernal master. He not only adopted the devil's opinion on this subject, but inculcated it with his usual vehemence in Germany: it has since been confirmed by an act of parliament in England.

However, whether we admit or reject the validity of the reasons before mentioned, they have induced the Bishop of Durham to publish a pamphlet against the Catholic doctrine of the eucha-

* The whole conference is narrated by Luther himself in his book, *De Missa privata et Unctione sacerdotum*, edit. Wittemb. tom. 7. fol. 228. It is in the sixth tome of the Jena edition, fol. 28,

rist: and that pamphlet he has thought proper to entitle, *The Grounds, on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome, reconsidered*. In the days when controversy flourished, the art of composing titles was no trifling acquirement; and by their proficiency in it, many of our predecessors obtained no small degree of reputation.* If the right reverend Prelate has not equalled them in quaintness of expression, he has at least surpassed them in originality of invention. Their titles pointed out the contents of their books: he has given to his book a title, which bears no reference to a single line contained in it. The title professes to be the grounds on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome: the book is composed of arguments to disprove the real presence in the eucharist, and to explain an answer in the church catechism. Certainly I shall not be told, that the Catholic doctrine respecting the eucharist, was one of the grounds on which the separation of the two churches was effected. Such an assertion would be to give the lie to the unanimous voice of historians. The true ground of the separation was the passion of Henry the Eighth for the accomplished, but unfortunate, Ann Boleyn.

* Thus, among our more ancient controvertists, we have "The Gagger gagged, or a new Gag for an old Goose"—"The Romish Fisher caught in his own Net"—"Maister Whyte dyed blacke"—"A Currycomb for a Coxcomb"—"A Pair of Spectacles for Sir Humphrey Hynde to see his Way withal"—"A Case for a Pair of Spectacles," &c. &c.

Paul, of a persecutor, became an apostle of the gospel: and the lust of Henry generated the independence of the English church. To raise his mistress to the throne, a divorce was necessary: but the method which he took to effect it did no honour either to his foresight or ingenuity. Modern controvertists would have taught him better. Had Messrs Le Mesurier and Granville Sharp been members of his council, they would have whispered the *Taxe Cancellariæ Apostolicæ* in his ears: and by an application to the Roman chancery, he might have purchased at a small expense the indulgence which he desired.* Or, could his pride have submitted to solicit the assistance of a theological rival, he might have applied to Luther; and I have no doubt the infallible apostle of the reformation would as readily have gratified the King of England with two wives at the same time, as he did the Landgrave of Hesse.† But, instead of these easy expedients, Henry determined to sue for a divorce in the court of Rome: and, strange as it must appear to every one, who knows that the Roman church is the mother of harlots, she, for some reason or other, hesitated to comply with

* If the reader wish to be acquainted with this pious fraud of former times, which duped not only the first disciples of the reformation, but even some of its present advocates, he may consult the General Vindication of the Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's charge, p. 173.

† See a short account of this edifying transaction in the same tract, p. 148.

his request. The passion of the king was irritated by delay ; and he soon discovered the means of cutting at once the Gordian knot. He declared himself the supreme head of the church : the clergy yielded to his pretensions ; and the two churches were separated. The consequence was natural. An obsequious primate pronounced the sentence of divorce, and the daughter of Sir Thomas Boleyn was substituted in the place of Catharine of Arragon. But, though the Church of England was thus separated from that of Rome, no alteration, if we except the article of supremacy, was made in their respective creeds. The doctrine of the real presence was still professed by the English clergy : and it formed the first of the six articles, which Henry, in the plenitude of his ecclesiastical power, enacted to repress the temerity of religious innovators. It is fortunate for the Bishop of Durham, that he did not live, and publish his pamphlet, at that time. The first head of the Church of England would have compelled him to recant at the door of St Paul's, or have sent him to the stake in Smithfield. The grounds on which he attempts to justify the separation of the two churches, would have convicted him of heresy, even among those whom he professes to defend.

Perhaps it may be said, that the right reverend Prelate alludes to the separation, which was effected, not in the reign of Henry, but under his daughter Elizabeth. Yet, even in this supposition, I contend that the title of the Bishop's pub-

lication is inaccurate. The separation at that period was made, not on doctrinal, but on political grounds. The marriage of Henry with Ann Boleyn had been pronounced invalid by the Roman see: and Elizabeth, the fruit of that marriage, could not be a member of the Catholic church, without virtually, at least, acknowledging her own illegitimacy, and resigning all claim to hereditary succession. A separation, therefore, from the Roman church, became expedient to her interests: and an act of parliament was procured, re-annexing to the crown all that ecclesiastical pre-eminence and jurisdiction, which had been assumed by her father, and renounced by the late queen, her sister. A separation was thus effected: but that separation was, in its origin, merely political, and in its progress, and conclusion, was the act not of the clergy, but of a lay tribunal. It was opposed by all the bishops except one: by both universities, and by both houses of convocation.* But the spiritual was unequal to the temporal power. The principal of the clergy were deprived of their benefices: the Church of England was dissolved: and a new church, professing new doctrines, and governed by a new polity, was established in its place. That this church did not join in communion with the see of Rome, I willingly admit: but at the same time, I contend that it did not separate from it. They never were united, and of

* Fuller, Ecclesias. Hist. 1. ix. p. 54. 56.

course could never be separated. For these reasons, I submit, that, whether the Bishop of Durham succeed or not in attempting to convict us of blasphemy, sacrilege, and idolatry, in our doctrine respecting the eucharist, he still cannot be justified in representing such doctrine as the ground of the separation of the Church of England from the Church of Rome.

REMARKS

ON THE

DOCTRINE OF THE BISHOP OF DURHAM,

WITH RESPECT TO

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

ACCORDING to the Catholic belief, the bread and wine in the sacrament of the eucharist, are made verily and indeed, the body and blood of Christ. This doctrine is grounded on the express words of our blessed Lord in the institution of the sacrament: *This is my body. This is my blood.* The natural import of these words is so very obvious, that I shall content myself with only one observation; that if Christ had wished to inculcate the Catholic doctrine, he could not have done it in terms better adapted to the purpose: and if he meant to inculcate the doctrine of the Church of England, he could hardly have selected words more likely to lead his disciples into error.

In opposition to this statement, the Bishop of Durham contends, that the words of Christ are to

be taken not in their literal, but in a figurative sense.* now to me it appears, that the presump-

* Lest the reader should ascribe to the right reverend Prelate the merit of this figurative discovery, I must inform him that it belongs to Zuinglius. The method by which that apostle came to the knowledge of it, is so very curious, that I shall transcribe the account from his own words in his book *De Subsidio Eucharistiæ*. After informing us that he had been disputing on the sacrament with little success, before the magistrates of Zurich, he proceeds thus. “ Early in the morning of the thirteenth of April, (I speak the truth, though unwillingly. For I know how I shall be laughed at: but my conscience forces me) early in the morning, I seemed in my sleep to be disputing with much difficulty against my adversary: and to be struck dumb, so that I could not defend what I knew to be the truth. —Then, most opportunely, a monitor seemed to be present (whether he were white or black I do not remember, for I relate a dream) who exclaimed, why, you blockhead, answer what is written *Exod. xii.* It is the pasch, that is, the pass-over of the Lord. As soon as I had seen this phantasm, I awake, leap out of bed, examine the passage, and by means of it dispel every difficulty from the minds of my audience. *Visus est monitor adesse: (ater fuerit an albus, nihil memini: somnia enim narro:) qui diceret; quin, ignave, respondeas ei quod Exod. xii. scribitur: est enim Phase, hoc est, transitus Domini, &c.*” The colour of this supernatural teacher is still a problem. The Bishop, probably, with Hospinian (*Hist. Sacram. par. 2. fol. 26.*) may think it a divine revelation: the infallible Luther is, however, of opinion, that it was an illusion of the devil; and therefore declares that Zuinglius, and all who follow his doctrine, are insatanized, supersatanized, and persatanized; and have the devil infused, perfused, and transfused into them. (See the Tigurine Divines, *Contra Confessionem Lutheri, tract. iii. p. 61.*) However, the doctrine of Zuinglius has been confirmed by act of parliament; and this must satisfy the conscience of every orthodox churchman.

tion is in favour of the literal meaning. If, as our adversaries maintain, it be from the scriptures, that each individual is to cull the articles of his creed, it is but reasonable to conceive, that the Holy Spirit will have delivered these articles in the sacred volumes, in terms the most natural and intelligible. To have described the more important points of christian belief and christian practice, in figurative or metaphorical language, susceptible of a thousand different meanings, would have been to sow the seeds of disunion, and to perplex the mind of the sincere inquirer. We may therefore lay it down as a canon of scriptural interpretation, that the literal should be considered as the true meaning, unless there be the clearest evidence of the contrary. The neglect of this canon has opened a door to every species of religious innovation. It has enabled men to explain away all the mysteries of christianity; and even to justify a subscription to the truth of doctrines, which at the same time, they suspect, perhaps believe, to be false.

It should moreover be observed, that the doctrine which maintains the literal meaning of the words, *this is my body; this is my blood*, is not of recent invention, or confined to the breasts of a few individuals. It was the uniform belief of the whole christian church at the time of the reformation. It had been the belief of the whole church for several centuries, according to the confession of our adversaries: according to our opinion, it had been so from the time of the apostles. At the present

day, it is the belief of the great majority of christians. It is believed by the Church of Rome, and all the western churches in communion with her. It is believed by all the Lutheran churches, though they are separated from her. It is believed by all the oriental churches, whether they admit, or reject her communion. Now it cannot be from any partiality to the Roman church, that the Lutherans profess this doctrine. They are the first born of the reformation, the lineal descendants of the great patriarch, Luther. Neither can we suppose, that it has been adopted by the eastern churches since their separation from those of the west. The jealousy with which religious sects view each other, excludes such an idea. This doctrine then must have been universally adopted before the disunion of the western and eastern churches: and, as this disunion can, in some instances, be traced back to the fifth century, it will follow, that the literal meaning has the testimony of almost fourteen ages in its favour. Certainly an opinion of such antiquity, and such almost universal diffusion in the christian church, is deserving of respect, and should not be abandoned, but on the strongest grounds. We will therefore examine the grounds on which the Bishop of Durham builds his opposition to it.

“ Our Saviour said,” (they are the words of the right reverend Prelate) “ This is my body which
 “ is broken for you. But at the institution of the
 “ sacrament his body was not broken ; and there-

“ fore the literal meaning could not have been the “ true meaning.”* This is the first of the “ conclusive arguments,” which the Bishop’s pastoral solicitude has transmitted from the metropolis to the clergy of his diocese, for their instruction and edification. That they have received it with gratitude and admiration, I have no doubt. It is their duty to do so. But the profane eye of the Catholic will not be so easily satisfied. It will scrutinize the structure of this episcopal syllogism, and will soon discover its defects. Will the Bishop of Durham inform us, what other body besides his real body, Christ suffered to be broken for us? Was it not by the breaking of his real body, that our redemption was effected? If then he gave the body that was broken for us, he gave his real, and not a figurative body. It is plain that the Greek participle, though in the present time, has a future signification; so very plain, that the Prelate himself, within the short space of six pages, forgetting his former objection, gives it that signification. “ The bread,” says he, “ which Christ brake, was “ an emblem of his body *to be broken*.”†

If my right reverend adversary be dissatisfied with this solution of his difficulty, he will allow me to propose to him an argument of similar form, and equally conclusive. When the angel announced to the Virgin the future birth of the Messiah, he said, “ the holy thing, which is

* Grounds, p. 1.

† Ibid, &c. p. 8.

“ born of thee shall be called the Son of God.”* But at that time the Messiah was not born: therefore the literal meaning could not be the true meaning, and the angel spoke not of a real, but a figurative Messiah. If the Bishop venture to answer this argument, I have no doubt that he will, at the same time, answer his own objection against the Catholic doctrine. I shall therefore beg permission on this head to refer him to himself.

The right reverend Prelate proceeds to inform us, that by the ceremonial law, which was not yet abrogated, the Jews were forbidden to eat blood; and thence infers, that it is very improbable Christ should give his own blood to christians in the eucharist.† If there be any person, to whom this argument appears “conclusive,” I do not envy him his powers of discernment: for my own part I should conceive I offered an insult to the judgment of my readers, were I seriously to attempt to refute it. *Tantum valeat, quantum valere potest.*

But, says the Bishop of Durham, “Christ was accustomed to speak of himself in figurative language.”‡ He was so: and the great

* In the original, the participles in both passages are in the present time *το γινωμενον*, Luke 1. 35. and *κλαμενον* 1 Cor. ii. 24. To the former the English translators gave very properly a future signification; to the latter they gave very prudently a present signification. The future savoured too much of the errors of popery.

† Grounds, &c. p. 2.

‡ Ibid.

difference between his language on those occasions, and his language at the institution of the sacrament, forms in my mind, a strong argument that the latter was meant to be understood literally and not figuratively. I know that our adversaries are accustomed to appeal with confidence to the expressions, "I am the vine, I am the door, &c." but I have still to learn on what that confidence is founded. In these propositions the predicate is indefinite: it is not demonstratively fixed to any one particular object, as in the words, this is my body. We do not read that Christ ever laid his hand on a vine, and said, I am *this* vine, or took hold of a door, and said I am *this* door, in the same manner as he took the bread into his hands, and said, *this* is my body. Let the unprejudiced reader turn to the passages in question, and he will immediately see that they are allegorical.—

"He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, is a thief and a robber. But he that entereth in by the door, is the shepherd of the sheep—*I am the door*: by me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved." "*I am the vine*, and my father is the husbandman. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine: no more can ye, except ye abide in me. *I am the vine*, ye are the branches."

From the whole context it is evident that this is figurative language: but in the institution of the sacrament, there is not the remotest intimation that the words, "this is my body," are figurative

language. In the former the sign is used for the thing signified ; in the latter, if the literal be not the true meaning, the thing signified is used for the sign. The difference, therefore, between these passages, is so strikingly marked, that I think myself fully justified in drawing from that difference the conclusion, that the expression, “ this is my body,” was meant to be understood literally.

The right reverend Prelate has, however, two other passages to produce, which he considers as exactly similar to the words, “ this is my body,” and which must, nevertheless, be understood in a figurative sense. The first is taken from St. Paul, “ *And that rock was Christ,*” “ not,” he adds, “ literally Christ, but figuratively an emblem of Christ.”* Now, I could wish to learn, what meaning the Bishop assigns to the words immediately preceding : “ Our fathers did all eat “ the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the “ same spiritual drink : for they drank of that “ spiritual rock that followed them.” Was this spiritual meat, and this spiritual drink, of the same nature as that which the right reverend Prelate recommends in his pamphlet to the notice of his Protestant brethren ? If it was, then they truly ate and drank Christ : the spiritual rock of which they drank was no emblem of Christ ; it was Christ himself. Does he on the contrary,

* Grounds, p. 9.

believe that the spiritual rock was in reality a material rock, and that the spiritual rock that followed the Israelites, was in reality a material rock that never moved from its place? Even this singular hypothesis can be of no service to its advocate: for the whole passage is evidently figurative. The apostle declares that he is speaking of figures, and of course we conclude that he is to be understood not literally, but figuratively. In the institution of the sacrament the case is very different. There we have no intimation of any figurative language, and consequently we are not prepared for it.

The other parallel expression adduced by the Bishop, is that of our Lord, recorded by St Luke. "This cup is the new testament in my blood." I am free to acknowledge that I do not perfectly understand his reasoning on it; but unless he prove, what I am sure he cannot prove, that its meaning is, this cup is the figure of the new testament in my blood, I do not see what assistance he can derive from it. It evidently has the same meaning as the words in St Matthew and St Luke: "this is my blood of the new testament."

But it is principally on "the memorable discourse, which Christ addressed to the Jews at Capernaum," that the Bishop of Durham rests his cause. "He could almost persuade himself that an attentive and impartial comparison of it, with the institution of the sacrament, would induce the Remarker and his friends to change

“ their sentiments.”* I fear, however, that the zeal of the Prelate sometimes indulges in fallacious expectations. So far am I from being induced to change my sentiments by this discourse, that I conceive it (and in this I believe every Catholic thinks with me) to afford the clearest demonstration of the truth of our doctrine. To it we constantly appeal, and I hope soon to convince the reader that it is not without reason that we do appeal to it. I will first transcribe the principal passages in that discourse, and then inquire which of the two, the Catholic or the Protestant belief is the more consonant to them.

“ I am the bread of life—the living bread,
 “ which came down from heaven. If any man
 “ eat of this bread, he shall live for ever, and the
 “ bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will
 “ give for the life of the world. Except ye eat
 “ the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his
 “ blood, ye have no life in you. For my flesh is
 “ meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.”

Now I must be allowed to maintain that, in the Catholic system, this language is plain and intelligible, while in the Protestant it is involved in so much obscurity, that no ingenuity can impart to it a rational meaning. If, as Catholics teach, the words, “ this is my body ; this is my blood,” are to be understood literally and not figuratively, if in the eucharist, the bread and wine become the real body

* Grounds, p. 3.

and blood of Christ, then it is indeed true that we eat “ the living bread which came down from “ heaven, even the flesh which Christ gave for the “ life of the world :” then indeed, “ we eat his “ flesh and drink his blood :” then with reason may it be said that “ his flesh is meat indeed, and “ his blood is drink indeed.” But if, as the Church of England teaches, the words of the institution of the sacrament are not to be understood literally, if in the eucharist, the bread and wine are mere emblems of Christ’s body and blood, then it cannot be true, that we eat the flesh which Christ gave for the life of the world ; then we eat only the figure of his flesh, and drink only the figure of his blood : then his flesh is not meat indeed, nor his blood drink indeed ; but meat is the emblem of his flesh, and drink is the emblem of his blood. And here I cannot but admire the presumptuous temerity of these men, who first maintain that the scriptures alone can be the ground of our faith, and that we are bound to believe whatever is clearly delivered in the scriptures ; and then come forward and unblushingly propound as matters of faith, doctrines which not only are not consonant, but are even contradictory to the express declarations of the scriptures. Christ says, “ this is my “ body,” they say, it is not his body : Christ says, “ my flesh is meat indeed, my blood is drink indeed,” they say, his flesh is not meat indeed, nor his blood drink indeed ; and because we refuse to believe them in preference to him, we are called

unscriptural, we are ridiculed as idiots, we are condemned to the torments of hell as idolators.* Nor is this all. Our scriptural adversaries can make us feel in our rights, as well as in our reputations: and because we will not swear that when Christ said, this is my body, he meant it was not his body, and will not subscribe to the truth of an opinion, which even the infallible Luther declares to have been first taught by the father of lies, we are denied the proudest distinctions, the best privileges of Englishmen.

Nothing, however, more forcibly demonstrates the truth of the Catholic doctrine on this subject, than the difficulty which figurative expositors experience in their endeavours to give any thing like a rational interpretation of the passages, “ My
“ flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink in-
“ deed. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of
“ man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in
“ you, &c.” Of this I wish for no better proof than what is furnished by the learned Prelate himself. Within the short space of two pages, he has made five attempts to explain them, but he has found this land of figures a land of mist and darkness: at each step he has plunged deeper and deeper into the mire of uncertainty and inconsistency. Several of his explanations are what a logician would term, *obscurum per obscurius*. Let the reader judge.

* Grounds, p. 8.

1st Explanation.—“ To eat Christ,” (under this expression, the Bishop comprises the meaning of all the passages transcribed before) “ is to incorporate with the mind the spiritual food of faith and righteousness.”* To *incorporate* with the *mind* the spiritual food of faith and righteousness! I trust it will not be thought disrespectful, if I decline making any comment on this explanation. To an orthodox intellect it may probably be sufficiently perspicuous: to mine it is an unknown tongue. “ It is a hard saying, and who can hear it?”

2d Explanation.—“ To eat Christ is to imbibe his doctrines, to digest his precepts, and to live by his example.”† This explanation is meant, I presume, to detail the whole process of mental incorporation mentioned in the last, which we are now told consists in drinking one thing, digesting another, and living by a third; in drinking doctrines, digesting precepts, and living by example.

3rd Explanation.—“ We eat Christ by having him in our minds, and meditating on his life and sufferings.”‡ This explanation possesses a merit, to which the two preceding explanations can make no claim: it can be understood. To me, however, it appears equally remote from the true meaning of our Saviour. To say of a man who reads a book with avidity, that he eats the book, is no

* Grounds, p. 6.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid, p. 6.

violation of the propriety of language; and thus Ezechiel is recorded to have eaten the roll of prophecy. But to say of one who thinks on the sufferings of another, that he eats his flesh and drinks his blood, is a harsh, unnatural expression, which the utmost extravagance of oriental metaphor cannot justify. Though the right reverend Prelate has referred me to Homer, as the best interpreter of the gospel, it is in vain that I have sought in Homer for a similar expression. His heroes may, indeed, gnaw their hearts, through grief and indignation; but I do not find that Achilles ever ate the flesh and drank the blood of Patrocles, or Priam of Hector, though the former thought frequently on the death of his friend, and the latter as frequently on the fall of his son.

4th Explanation.—“ To eat Christ is to believe in him; and to eat his flesh is to keep up the remembrance of him, especially of his death.”* Here the right reverend Prelate appears to extend the limits of that indulgence which he granted in the preceding explanation. “ To eat Christ is to believe in him.” It will not, I trust, be contended that to believe in Christ, and to meditate on his life and sufferings, are synonymous expressions. Thousands believe in him, who never meditate on his life and sufferings. These, however, we now learn, also eat him. Of course it must be conceded, that the preceding was but a

* Ibid.

partial and very inadequate explanation. A distinction, however, is drawn between eating Christ and eating his flesh : for the latter it is not only requisite to believe in him ; we must moreover keep up the remembrance of him, especially of his death. What foundation there may be for this distinction, I know not.

5th Explanation.—“ To eat the body of Christ, therefore, and to drink his blood at the sacrament, are figurative terms to denote an act of faith, by which we profess our faith in Christ, and commemorate his death, by eating the representative and vicarious elements of bread and wine.”*

Thus at length are we arrived at the important conclusion, which the right reverend Prelate has been so long in search of. To eat the body and drink the blood of Christ, is to eat, not his body, but bread, as a representation and substitute for his body, and to drink, not his blood, but wine, as a representation and substitute for his blood. Now, I appeal to every dispassionate reader, whether the Jews at Capernaum were so much to blame for not understanding in this manner the words of our Saviour. Here we have seen a prelate of distinguished abilities and erudition toiling and writhing under the difficulty of the investigation ; adopting four different explanations before he had the good fortune to light upon the true one ; and afterwards so convinced

* Grounds, p. 7.

of the obscurity of his labours, that he determines to write seven more pages in order to explain that explanation. How then can we expect that the Jews should have arrived at the same conclusion? They were a poor unlettered crowd: they possessed not the advantage of reading the scriptures in their native tongue: they could not acquire that theological acumen and biblical discernment, which the Bishop informs us is only to be found in Protestant universities.* Though he blame them, I really think they were more deserving of pity than of censure; and I conceive the majority of my readers, instead of condemning them, will wonder why our Saviour did not condescend to their ignorance, and tell them, that after all, he was speaking figuratively, and only wished his disciples to visit a Protestant church, and there eat a bit of bread, and drink a cup of wine. This would at once have done away every difficulty.

But is it then so very evident that the Jews did mistake the meaning of our Saviour on this occasion? That they understood him to speak of a real eating of his flesh, and of a real drinking of his blood, I acknowledge: and that the Bishop of Durham understands him to speak of a figurative eating, and a figurative drinking, I cannot deny. Their opinions are evidently contradictory; but I have been so much in the habit of disputing the statements of the right reverend Prelate, that he will not, I trust, be

* Bishop of Durham's charge, p. 10, 11, Quarto edition.

disappointed, if I hesitate to prefer his authority before theirs. I have therefore considered the subject with no small degree of attention : and the more I have considered it, the more reason I have seen to believe, that the Jews were in the right. I do not mean to say, that they may not have formed erroneous conclusions in their own minds, as to the manner in which the manducation of our Saviour's body was to be effected ; but in as much as they understood him to speak of a real eating and a real drinking, so far I contend that they understood his real meaning.

From the narrative of the evangelist, we learn that the audience of our blessed Lord, on this occasion, was divided into two parties, of those who believed, and those who disbelieved, his mission. Now had these differed respecting the meaning of his discourse, there would have been, I confess, some ground for the Bishop's opinion. But they were unanimous on this subject : both understood him to speak of a real eating of his body, and a real drinking of his blood. If the latter asked, " how can this man give us his flesh to eat ?" the former exclaimed, " this is a hard saying, and " who can hear it ?" Many of them even abandoned him, and went over to his enemies. Hence we must adopt one of these two conclusions : either that our Lord did not speak of a figurative eating, or that he addressed his audience in a language, which neither his enemies nor his friends could understand. Now the latter of these suppositions

appears on the very face of it utterly improbable. He did, indeed, sometimes employ enigmatical language; but then it was on very different occasions. Here he was delivering instruction to those who sought it: he was explaining to them the most sacred and solemn ordinance in the religion which he had undertaken to establish: and consequently he would employ such language as was most proper to convey his meaning, and would explain such passages as he had perceived to be misunderstood. Let us suppose that the Bishop of Durham had been present, and had heard the Jews ask, “how can this man give us his flesh to eat?” Would he not immediately have exclaimed, “you are under a mistake. He speaks not of a real, but of a figurative eating. Nothing can be more easy. To eat Christ, is to believe in him, to have him in your mind, and to meditate on him?” But did our Saviour answer in this manner? Did he tell them, that they misunderstood him, that he was speaking in a figurative sense? No. He endeavoured to confirm them in their opinion. He repeated his former assertion: he inculcated it in the strongest terms that language could furnish: he declared that their salvation depended on their adhesion to it: and, to impress it the deeper in their minds, he confirmed it with the sanction of an oath. “Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you—for my flesh is

“ meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He
 “ that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood,
 “ dwelleth in me; and I in him. As the living
 “ Father has sent me, and I live by the Father,
 “ so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.”

I appeal to every impartial reader, whether the manifest import of these words be not to confirm the Jews in the opinion of a real manducation, which they had previously conceived. Truly, if this were a mistake, the Bishop of Durham must, I think, confess, that Christ, the God of all truth, exerted all his power to lead his unsuspecting hearers into error.

The disciples of our Saviour appear to have listened to this discourse with extraordinary interest. Like his adversaries, they had understood him in the literal and not in a figurative sense; and like them they had been perplexed at the apparent impossibility of such a doctrine. When therefore the objection was proposed, “ how can
 “ this man give us his flesh to eat?” They seem to have flattered themselves with the hope, that it would be explained in a sense less repugnant to their notions and feelings. They were disappointed; and expressed their disappointment by exclaiming, “ this is a hard saying, and who can hear it?” Thus a new opportunity was offered to our Saviour of undeceiving them, if his former words had been misunderstood. Yet what did he do? He permitted them to depart, and attributed their apostacy not to mistake, but to incredulity:

“ there are some of you that believe not.” This observation alone appears to me to set the question at rest. That doctrine which they disbelieved was evidently the doctrine of really eating the body, and really drinking the blood, of Christ: now Christ certainly would not reproach them with the disbelief of any other doctrine than that which he had taught; therefore we may safely infer that the doctrine of Christ, respecting the eating of his body and the drinking of his blood, was to be understood in the literal and not in a figurative sense.

After the departure of the disciples, our Lord turned to the twelve apostles, and asked them, whether they also meant to leave him. Now what was their answer? Did they say, that they had not fallen into the same error with the others, but understood him to have spoken of a figurative eating, and a figurative drinking? On the contrary they appear to acknowledge that they had experienced the same difficulties, but had captivated their judgment unto the obedience of faith. They believe all that he has said, because they know him to be the Messiah. “ Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” Thus the conduct of our Lord, the incredulity of the Jews, the apostacy of the disciples, and the faith of the apostles, all concur to prove that our Saviour spoke, on this occasion, of a real and not a figurative eat-

ing of his flesh, and of a real and not a figurative drinking of his blood.

But the Bishop of Durham has discovered a passage, which he persuades himself is a sufficient explanation of the meaning of our Saviour. After the disciples had expressed their surprise at his doctrine, he replied, “ Does this offend you ? “ What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend “ up where he was before ? It is the spirit that “ quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the “ words that I speak unto you are spirit and life.” This passage, “ It is the spirit that quickeneth, “ the flesh profiteth nothing,” was, we are told, expressly meant to correct the misapplication of Christ’s former words.* Now, here also I must beg leave to dissent from the right reverend Prelate. To me the fact itself appears to demonstrate that this passage was not meant for any such purpose. Had Christ intended by it to remove the impression, which his former discourse had made on the minds of his disciples, it would infallibly have removed that impression. Had he designed by it to teach that he had spoken of a figurative eating and drinking, they would have understood him in that sense: and if they had so understood him, they would not have abandoned him. The very fact of their having abandoned him after these words, shews that they did not consider them in the same light as the Bishop of Durham: for there

* Grounds, p. 4.

certainly could be nothing in the figurative doctrine so shocking to the feelings or prejudices of the disciples, as to induce them to disbelieve a man, whom they had seen working the most stupendous miracles, and whom, on the faith of those miracles, they had followed as the promised Messiah. If then it be asked, what sense I affix to the passage in question, I would consider it as an illustration, and would paraphrase it in this manner. “As it
 “is the spirit that quickeneth, and the body without the spirit is but a lifeless corpse, so the words
 “which I have spoken to you are the spirit and
 “life of the soul. Unless you believe them you
 “are dead. And there are some among you,
 “who believe not.” This explanation appears to me the most natural comment on the words of our Saviour, and the most consonant to the narrative of the evangelist.

These observations will, I trust, convince most of my readers, that the Catholic doctrine respecting the eucharist has some pretensions to the title of scriptural doctrine. Indeed I do not know that any article of the christian faith is expressed in the sacred volumes in clearer and less exceptionable terms. I shall not, therefore, fatigue the reader by noticing and refuting the other objections of the right reverend Prelate. None of them can lay claim to the merit of novelty. They are as old as the reformation: one of them is of still greater antiquity: it is as old as christianity. It was the very objection of the Jews at Capernaum. When our

Saviour promised us his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink, they thought it impossible, and exclaimed, "how can this man give us his flesh to eat?" In like manner, when we say that in the eucharist Christ gives us his flesh there really present to eat, and his blood there really present to drink, the Bishop of Durham declares it to be impossible, and calls out, how can Christ's body be both in heaven and on earth; how can it be eaten by many different persons at the same time? When he is perfectly acquainted with the limits of God's omnipotence; when he can clearly explain the relations which spirits bear to time and place; when he can shew us what that is which is the subject of the primary and secondary qualities in matter, then we shall listen with deference to his decisions on these questions: till then he may, if he think it more prudent, imitate the incredulity of the Jews and disciples at Capernaum; but he must permit us to follow the docility of the apostles: like them to subject our understanding to the words of Christ, and with Peter to say, "Lord, thou hast
 " the words of eternal life: we believe and have
 " known that thou art the Christ, the Son of the
 " living God."

But to have shewn that we had misunderstood the words of Christ, in the institution of the sacrament, was not enough to justify the orthodoxy of the Bishop of Durham. He proceeds to accuse us of idolatry; and, as if we were already condemned, pronounces us aliens from the kingdom of heaven.

His zeal, however, is not without a precedent to justify it. We have before heard of men, “ who “ could strain at a gnat, while they swallowed a “ camel:” and the right reverend Prelate may in like manner be allowed to neglect the fashionable vices of the age, that he may the more efficaciously call down the vengeance of heaven on the imaginary idolatry of the Catholics. Than this, he appears to think, no offence can be committed less problematical in its nature, or more pernicious in its consequences. At the commencement of the present session of parliament, he saw the table of the House of Lords covered with bills of divorce, and he was silent: from a late investigation he became acquainted with those mysteries of iniquity which have roused the indignation of the country; and he still was silent: he daily sees instances of that moral and political corruption, which characterize the present times; and yet he still observes the most obstinate silence. Against the seducer, the adulterer, the peculator of the public money, he has no charges to preach, no pamphlets to publish, no memorials to present to his majesty; all his curses are reserved for his Catholic brethren. Them he pronounces guilty of sacrilege, blasphemy, and idolatry: them he represents as worthy of hatred here, and of endless torments hereafter.* And for what purpose is all this? To rekindle the flame of religious animosity? To add to the dis-

* Grounds, p. 8.

content of five millions of his majesty's subjects, who claim, and have hitherto claimed in vain, the common rights and privileges of their countrymen? Let him look at the condition of Europe. The continent is at the feet of Bonaparte: and woe to this empire if its inhabitants ever become a disunited people. "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city divided against itself shall not stand."

But let us inquire in what manner the Bishop proves the justice of this charge. It is in a very summary way. "If," says he, "the papist worship the host as the image of God, or take that for a transubstantiated God, which (for reasons before given) is no God; in either case it is a violation of the second commandment, and is idolatry." It may, probably, be sufficient to reply in a similar style: if the Catholics worship as Christ, that which (for reasons before given) is Christ, it is no violation of the second commandment, and no idolatry. But, even were the Bishop's supposition true, would the consequence necessarily follow? I must confess that I do not think so. If, conceiving that to be Christ, which in reality is not Christ, I worship it as Christ, I am guilty of a mistake, but I am not guilty of idolatry. My adoration is directed to Christ, and as such will be accepted by him. When Sysigambis fell at the feet of Hephæstion, whom she took for Alexander, was it an act of treason? Adoration is an act of the mind, and must be directed

to some object apprehended by the mind. Consequently in the eucharist we do not adore bread and wine, for this plain reason, that we do not believe bread and wine to exist in it. We adore only Christ himself. A contrary notion is so preposterous, that I do not think it could find admission into any mind but that of an orthodox churchman. He is taught, that in the sacrament he receives the body and blood of Christ, though at the same time he believes the body and blood of Christ not to exist in the sacrament: and such a man may perhaps persuade himself that the Catholic adores bread and wine in the eucharist, though at the same time he believes neither bread nor wine to exist in the eucharist. To all others it will appear impossible.

As this accusation of idolatry is a new subject, I conceive it to have been introduced for the purpose of affording an opportunity to the right reverend Prelate, of vindicating a most insulting passage in his original charge: that our doctrine of the eucharist necessarily disposes the mind of the Catholic to worship creatures for the Creator. In reply the Remarker asked, what answer the Bishop of Durham would give to an unitarian, who, in like manner, should assert that the established doctrine of the divinity of Christ necessarily disposed the Protestant mind to adore the creature instead of the Creator! It is amusing to observe, how reluctant the Bishop and his advocates are to reply to this question: and with

what anxiety they endeavour to evade it by instituting a parallel between the doctrines of the two churches. This, however, is only throwing dust into the eyes of their readers. I might easily object to the accuracy of their statements; but I do not wish to multiply the subjects of discussion. Whoever has observed how in the course of this controversy each reply and rejoinder has added to their number, will confess that it is more expedient to contract than to extend its limits. I shall therefore content myself with renewing the pledge which has been repeatedly given by the Remarker: that if the bishop or his advocates will condescend to answer his question, he will shew that their answer will prove a satisfactory refutation of the Bishop's insulting suggestion. Till they do this, the public will consider their silence as a confession that it is unfounded.

From idolatry, the Bishop proceeds to the denial of the cup, a subject on which his orthodoxy prompts him to condemn us of sacrilege. With opprobrious terms I have no concern. Them I shall leave to the discretion of my right reverend opponent, and confine myself to the consideration of his arguments. On this subject, "the points at issue between us" (he must indulge me in the expression) are, first, whether there be any command that all christians should communicate in both kinds; secondly, whether the participation of the cup be essential to the sacrament; and, thirdly, whether the practice of the primitive

church prove the refusal of the cup to be a sacrilege.

1.—That there is such a command the Bishop of Durham attempts to shew by the following argument. “ No one ever doubted that *take, eat,* “ is obligatory on the whole body of christians, “ without any restriction of the bread to the apostles then present : and it requires all the prejudice “ of education to find in the word *all* of the other “ command, ‘ drink ye *all* of this,’ a restraining “ power, which could imply the exclusion of all “ christians who were not present, from the participation of the cup.”* Is this wit, or is it argument? Whatever it may be, we at least are not such idiots as to believe that the words, *drink ye all of this*, imply an “ exclusion of all christians, “ who were not present, from the cup.” Is there no medium between a command addressed to all christians, and a prohibition addressed to all? If we do not allow the words to be a command, must it necessarily follow that we understand them as a prohibition? But, if the right reverend Prelate believe that “ no one ever doubted of *take, eat,* being a command obligatory on the whole body of “ christians,” he must allow me to inform him that he is in an error. The very fact itself proves that these words contain no such command. The apostles were sitting at table with our Saviour: he took bread, brake it into pieces, and distributed it

* Grounds, &c. p. 26.

among them, saying: "take, eat, this is my body." What but the prejudice of education can discover in these words a command addressed to all succeeding generations? He then took the cup, and gave it to them to drink in succession, saying: "drink ye all of this." And here, again, what but the prejudice of education can discover in these words a second command addressed in like manner to all generations? I do believe that every reader, whose mind is not predisposed by theological doctrines, will confess with me, that both expressions were no more than invitations addressed by Christ to his apostles, to eat his body and drink his blood in the sacrament, which he then instituted.

2.—Is the participation of the cup essential to the sacrament? The Bishop of Durham repeatedly asserts that it is: but by his own concessions sufficiently proves that it is not. It certainly cannot be that the sacrament can remain, when that which is essential to its existence is removed. Since then my learned adversary allows, that, in the ancient church, it was on many occasions administered under one kind only, and since a greater authority than his, an act of parliament, permits, in certain cases, the same to be done in the present Church of England, he must, I think, be content to agree with me, that the cup is not an essential part of the sacrament.

3.—The Bishop appears to ground his doctrine principally on the practice of the ancient church. Now the question is not, whether, to communicate

in both kinds were the more general practice of the ancient church, (that no Catholic will deny): but whether such practice be so essential to christianity that no human power could lawfully alter it. We maintain that it was not: and the lawfulness of the alteration has been demonstrated in the Remarks, by several instances of the alteration of ancient practices, which by the laws of his church, and the customs of his own courts, the Bishop of Durham is compelled to approve. To this argument no answer has been attempted either by the Bishop or by his advocates. I have therefore hitherto a right to consider it as unanswerable.*

* In defending the practice of his church, the Vindicator had alluded to the words of the apostle, "whosoever shall eat this bread *or* drink this cup of the Lord unworthily," and had observed that the English translators had improved this passage by substituting the conjunctive particle *and* in the place of the disjunctive particle *or*. The Bishop of Durham replies: "We cannot be surprised that *ו* and *וא* should be often used one for the other, when we recollect, that in the native language of the apostle the particle (*vau*) was used in both senses." On this valuable specimen of biblical criticism, I may be indulged in a few remarks. First, though Hebrew scholars are accustomed to consider the conjunctive as having sometimes the force of the disjunctive particle, is it certain that their doctrine is accurate? In all the instances of the kind, which I have seen, it appears to me to be either a false reading, or to imply not a disjunction, but a repetition of some other words in the sentence. 2. What has this doctrine to do with the passage quoted from St Paul? The apostle does not employ the conjunctive, but the disjunctive particle. Let then the Bishop of Durham shew, that, in the Hebrew language, the disjunctive has the force of the conjunctive particle,

Before I take my leave of this subject, I must notice some observations of the right reverend Prelate, which regard the character of his opponents, more than the goodness of the cause which they have undertaken to defend. An inference, which the Vindicator had drawn from the works of Pope Leo, has afforded the Bishop an opportunity of charging that writer with disingenuousness, misrepresentation, and shameless sophistry. Reader, these are serious accusations; and if they can be substantially proved, I must acknowledge that the Vindicator is deserving of thy hatred and contempt. But what would be thy sentiments, if the man, who thus accuses his adversary, were himself guilty of these crimes; if, while he displays this virtuous indignation against the imaginary misrepresentations of another, he were actually employed in attempting to deceive,

and his reasoning will apply. 3. I will allow him, that, by a scriptural bull, the inspired writer might conceive, that, as *and* meant *or* in Hebrew, *or* might mean *and* in Greek: but, in return, I shall insist that it was equally probable, that he would use *and* for *or* in Greek, according to his vernacular idiom. If this be granted me, (and I see not how it can be reasonably denied,) I shall maintain that the passage, “as often as ye do eat this bread *and* drink this cup,” should be rendered, “as often as ye do eat this bread, *or* drink this cup.” The truth is, when we thus take the liberty of altering the natural signification of words, we may make the scripture speak just what we please.

“The text inspires not us, but we the text inspire.”

DRYDEN.

by misrepresentation, the confidence of his readers? The Vindicator had understood, and does still understand, the Pope to say, that the Manichees endeavoured to conceal themselves from public notice, by communicating with the christians, and communicating, too, under one kind only. Hence it was inferred (I think justly) that many of the congregation, also, communicated in the same manner: otherwise, the very refusal to take the cup would have betrayed those, who sought thus to conceal themselves. Now, how does the Bishop endeavour to refute this inference? He pretends to transcribe the whole passage, not in the original language, (it did not suit his purpose) but in an English translation: and in that translation carefully suppresses the very words, on which the Vindicator's reasoning was grounded. The pope says, "*Cum ad tegendam infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant: ut interdum tutius lateant, ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt, sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant.*"* If you look for the important words, *ut tutius lateant*, that they may the more safely conceal themselves, you will not find them in the Bishop's version. In their place, he has substituted, "*to impose on the public,*"† a phrase for which there is not the

* Sermon 4. De quadrag.

† Grounds, &c. p. 25.

least authority in the language of the pontiff. And here allow me to ask the right reverend Prelate, whether he consider the two phrases as being of exactly the same import? If he do, what reason can he assign for rejecting that, which was more conformable to the original? If he do not, how can he clear himself from the guilt of misrepresentation?

But this is not the only instance, in which the Bishop of Durham has displayed his proficiency “in the art of adulterating ancient testimony.” He has favoured us with a version of a passage, attributed to Pope Gelasius: and has executed this version with as much fidelity as that from Pope Leo. It is as follows: “We find that some persons, through I know not what superstition, after partaking of the bread, refuse the cup, who, without doubt, ought to receive both kinds, or to abstain from both.”* Now the real words of the pontiff are: “We find that some persons, after partaking of the *sacred body*, abstain from the cup of the *sacred blood*, who (*because* they are said to be influenced by I know not what superstition) should, undoubtedly, receive both kinds, or be *excluded* from both kinds. *Comperimus, quod quidam, sumpta tantummodo corporis sacri portione a calice sacri cruoris abstineant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi) aut*

* Grounds, &c. p. 24.

“ *integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur.*”* Now, besides the other infidelities in the Bishop’s version, why, I ask, was the passage within the parenthesis removed from its place, and the word *because* omitted. I fear for this reason, that, as it stood in the original, it entirely refuted the inference which the Bishop wished to draw from it. It shewed that the reason why they were to be compelled to receive both kinds was, because they refused the cup through superstition, and at the same time intimates, that, had it not been for that superstition, they would not have been molested. If the reader ask what their superstition was, I answer, (supposing the decree to be genuine,† and the persons alluded to Manichees,) that it consisted in believing wine to be the creature of the evil spirit, and of course incapable of being consecrated, and forbidden to be drunk. Whence the pope proceeds to condemn them of a great sacrilege, by dividing one and the same mystery. *Quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire.*

There is another subject, on which, if we may

* Decret. 3, part. dist. 11. c. 12.

† The Bishop asks what reason there is to doubt its authenticity. I answer, several. 1. The letter, from which it professes to be taken, is not to be found in any collection of the letters of Gelasius. 2. The passage itself appears to have no connexion whatever with the remainder of the letter, which occurs, cau. 25. q. 2. c. 25. 3. It is not noticed by any writer who lived before the twelfth century.

believe the Bishop of Durham, the Vindicator has been guilty of “ a misrepresentation, as disingenuous and perverse as his abuse of Leo’s testimony. A statute of Edward VI. c. 1. which enjoins the reception of the sacrament in both kinds, except in cases of necessity, where it is impossible for the communicant to receive more than one, is alleged by him as a justification of the popish denial of the cup to those who are able to receive both. The Vindicator is endeavouring to justify the popish denial of the cup to the laity: but the permission of the eucharist in one kind only, in cases of *necessity*, gives no countenance to the entire suppression of one kind.”* It is with considerable reluctance that I here again find myself compelled to retort the charge against the right reverend accuser. To convict his adversary, he commits the very crime of which he accuses him: to support the charge of misrepresentation, he has recourse to misrepresentation himself. He suppresses the inference, which the Vindicator drew from the statute of Edward VI. and in its place substitutes an inference, which the Vindicator did not draw. That writer did not allege the lawfulness of receiving under one kind, in cases of necessity, as a justification of the denial of the cup, when there was no necessity; nor did he argue that the permission of one kind, on such occasions, proved the

* Grounds, p. 33.

lawfulness of the entire suppression of one kind. This reasoning exists nowhere but in the imagination of the Bishop of Durham. The immediate point in discussion was, whether the cup were an essential part of the sacrament: and the *Vindicator* contended, that, since it might be lawfully suppressed, without injury to the sacrament, it was not an essential part. Take his words. “ In “ the first of Edward VI. c. 1. it was enacted, that “ the most blessed sacrament be hereafter *com-* “ *monly* delivered, and ministered, unto the peo- “ ple under both kinds, that is to say, of bread “ and wine, except necessity otherwise require. “ Hence it will follow, that the English church “ did not originally conceive the wine to be an “ essential part of the sacrament. For, those who “ say that one kind should not be administered “ commonly, grant that it may be done some- “ times; and by specifying the case of necessity, “ acknowledge the propriety of the doctrine, that “ teaches only one kind to be *essential* to the sa- “ crament.” If thus to pervert the reasoning of an adversary, and, on such perversion, to accuse him of misrepresentation, be not the most disingenuous kind of misrepresentation that can exist, I have yet to learn what misrepresentation means.*

* This answer, I trust, will satisfy the authors of the *British Critic*. It was certainly grateful in them to praise the labours of their patron, but it was impolitic to do it in so unguarded a manner as to betray their ignorance of the work of the writer, whose disgrace they are so eager to record. With equal preci-

The Bishop informs us, that the statute of Edward VI. is still in force. May I then recommend it to his notice? Perhaps, from the moderation with which it is worded, he may learn to condemn the intemperance of his own language. Do its authors say, that to communicate under one kind is “ a sacrilege, and a violation of the divine command?” No, but that to communicate under both kinds is “ more agreeable to the first institution of the sacrament, and more conformable to the practice of the apostles, and of the primitive church.” Do they pronounce those, who follow the opposite opinion, to be “ mutilators of the sacrament, and derogators from the mediatorship of God the Son?” No: they expressly declare that it is not their intention to condemn the usage of any other church. They were not such inconsequent reasoners, as to teach that the eucharist might be sometimes given under one kind, and, at the same time, to affirm that those who did give it under one kind were guilty of sacrilege, mutilated the sacrament, and violated the command of Christ. Such language as this was reserved for more modern controvertists.

But, if I mistake not, that which has kindled the flame of indignation in the breast of the right

pitance, in their review of Stephenson's Romish Church, they wonder what reply Mr Des Mahis can make to his victorious opponent. Had they ever opened the work, of which they pretend to judge, they would have known that he could make no reply. It is more than a century since he was laid in the grave!

reverend Prelate, is the following passage in the Vindicator's Letter to the Durham Clergyman.

“ That, in theory, the faith which you profess,
 “ is founded on scripture, may, or may not, be
 “ true: that in practice it is founded on the autho-
 “ rity of parliament, will not be denied. Acts of
 “ parliament alone can make articles of faith: and
 “ acts of parliament alone can declare any doc-
 “ trine heretical. Whether, or not, the Church
 “ of Christ be of this world, it is evident the
 “ Church of England is.” “ In this short pas-
 “ sage,” observes the Bishop of Durham, “ there
 “ are three falsehoods.” I suspect they are three
 truisms. “ It is false to say acts of parliament
 “ make articles of faith. Parliament declares
 “ them, but does not make them.”* The distinc-
 tion is ingenious. There is certainly a difference
 in the sound, if there be none in the meaning of
 the words. Parliament is not infallible: it is
 therefore possible, that it may declare an article of
 faith, which is not founded in scripture: and in
 this case, would not the declaration amount to the
 making of an article of faith? Let me ask, whe-
 ther there be any tribunal in the world besides the
 “ high court of parliament,” that can add to, or
 take from, the thirty-nine articles of the Church
 of England? And if parliament were to strike out
 a certain number of these articles, or to “ declare”
 a certain number of additional ones, would not

* Grounds, &c. p. 34.

every orthodox clergyman, whether that reduction or augmentation were, or were not, according to scripture, be compelled to subscribe to the altered copy? I appeal then to every man of common sense, whether it be not true to say, that acts of parliament alone can make articles of faith, and that, in practice, the faith of the established church is founded on the authority of parliament. The Bishop proceeds to boast "that the Church of England is no otherwise of this world, than prophecy declared the Church of Christ should be, in predicting that kings should be her nursing fathers, and queens her nursing mothers." Had the prophet, however, foreseen the result of a late investigation, he would have known that other princes, besides kings, have been nursing fathers, and other ladies, besides queens, have been nursing mothers, to the church.

Among the predecessors of the Bishop of Durham, was a Doctor Howson, as ambitious of gaining laurels in the field of controversy as the present right reverend Prelate, and as unsuccessful in his attempts. Confident in his own abilities, this theological pedant is recorded to have declared, that "he would loosen the Pope from his chair, though he were fastened thereto with a tenpenny nail."* In defiance, however, of Doctor Howson's loosening powers, the Pope remained seated in his chair: and in like manner, I trust, that, notwithstanding

* Hutchinson's *Durham*, vol. 1. p. 494.

Doctor Barrington's "conclusive arguments," Catholics will continue to profess the belief of their fathers in the real presence; and to those, who seek to satisfy them with figurative explications, will reply, with the poet—

Why all this frantic pain
To construe what his clearest words contain,
And make a riddle what he made so plain?

REMARKS

ON THE

BISHOP OF DURHAM'S EXPLANATION

OF

THE ANTEPENULTIMATE ANSWER

IN THE

CHURCH CATECHISM.

THE last subject which the right reverend Prelate discusses, and that for which the whole pamphlet appears to have been written, is an attempt to explain, in a rational manner, the established doctrine respecting the Lord's supper. In the prosecution of this plan, he does not spare the character or feelings of his adversary. He condemns him of blasphemous levity, pronounces him unworthy of religious toleration, and reminds him of the laws enacted against those who attempt to malign the doctrines and ordinances of the Established Church.* There was a time when the Bishop of Durham deprecated "the revival of

* Grounds, p. 57. 44.

impassioned controversy ;” but his prudence has at last been subdued by his zeal ; and his present conduct, joined to his promise of many more publications of a similar tendency, call to my recollection those lines of the poet :—

Furor iraque mentem

Præcipitant, pulchrumque mori succurrit in armis.

Allow me, however, to ask what sufficient cause I have given for this angry language, these opprobrious insinuations, these threats of vengeance ? Had I forged a false creed for my unoffending neighbours, and, on the strength of this forgery, had held them out to the derision and hatred of the public ; or had I, at a moment when the very existence of the nation was at stake, attempted by misrepresentation to divide it against itself, and arm five millions of British subjects against the Established Church ; then indeed I might think myself deserving of the vengeance of the laws, and unworthy of toleration in civilized society. But I have done none of these things. I have only repelled a most illiberal and unprovoked aggression ; and have taught the aggressor to feel that he is not himself invulnerable. In the Remarks, I gave him a gentle hint, that his language might easily be retorted on himself. But that hint was despised ; and his advocates, with all the pride of conscious superiority, rushed forward to trample into dust the man who had presumed to question the accuracy or the judgment of the Bishop of

Durham. They met, however, with a resistance they were not taught to expect ; and now, unable to overcome him in argument, they vent their disappointment in threats and insults. Yet, what is in reality the crime of which I am accused ? of saying that the established doctrine respecting the Lord's supper appeared to me a paradox, and something like nonsense. “ This is the head and “ front of my offending.” Let the reader compare this with the Bishop's charges against us, of blasphemy, sacrilege, and idolatry, of patronizing ignorance, encouraging vice, and adulterating the scriptures, of derogating from the honour of God the Father, from the mediatorship of God the Son, and from the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit, and, instead of condemning me of intemperance, he will, I trust, praise my moderation : instead of thinking that I have transgressed the bounds of decorum, he will thank me for chastising that temerity, which, because the thirty-nine articles have been confirmed by act of parliament, arrogates to itself the privilege of defaming and calumniating every other church.

The Bishop of Durham begins this part of his pamphlet by observing, that the difficulty which the Remarker finds in conceiving the Established doctrine respecting the eucharist, originates in the *duplicity* of that writer. Without returning the compliment, I shall inquire in what manner that doctrine has been explained by the Bishop and his advocates. If their explanations prove discordant,

I shall infer that it is not so very easy to understand; if the very teachers of Israel cannot agree respecting its meaning, I trust it cannot be a very great crime if others do not perfectly comprehend it.

The first of these expositors (the first, if not in reputation, at least in time) was Elijah Index, of facetious memory, who, with his accustomed *naïveté*, acknowledged that the eucharist is nothing more than a *plain, simple, commemorative rite*; that the words of the catechism are at first sight repugnant to the real doctrine of the Church of England; and that the faithful communicant receives verily and indeed, not the body and blood of Christ, but the benefit of the sacrament.* How far this answer was admired by his diocesan, I know not: but the next writer, who made the attempt, and whose labours were honoured with that prelate's approbation, offered to the public a different exposition. He contended that the answer in the catechism was accurate: that to eat the body and to drink the blood of Christ, is to partake of the blessings which his body broken, and his blood shed, have purchased for us: and that the hallowed elements are an instrumental cause, by which actual possession is given of all the graces which his sacrificed body can yield: that they are to us his body and blood.† This interpretation was permitted to assume the honours

* Protestant's Reply, p. 14. Reply to the Review, p. 21.

† Letter by a Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham, p. 23, 24.

of orthodox doctrine during the long period of ten months : at the expiration of that term a new discovery was made ; and the same writer assured us, that to receive the body and blood of Christ was no longer “ to receive the graces which his sacrificed body can yield,” but to be put in possession of the title to that inheritance, which Christ purchased for us with his blood.* To this decision also I bowed with becoming respect, under the persuasion that the obligation of assenting to it would not be of very long continuance. Nor have I been disappointed. The right reverend Prelate, sensible of the errors of his advocates, has taken his cause into his own hands, and has transmitted to his clergy a letter of instruction on this very important subject. To this letter I request the reader’s attention, trusting that it has set the question at rest, and that for the future the orthodox mind will no more “ be tossed to and fro, and carried about with so many winds of doctrine.”

1. The Bishop informs us that the Church of England “ acknowledges the spiritual presence of “ Jesus Christ,” that “ the faithful receive spiritually *at* the sacrament that which exists there “ spiritually,” and therefore “ that the body and “ blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and “ received by the faithful *in* the Lord’s supper.”† If these words have any meaning, they must mean

* Clergyman’s Second Letter, p. 41.

† Grounds, p. 39.

that the body and blood of Christ are really though spiritually present *at* or *in* the Lord's supper; are really taken and received by each faithful communicant. Here then we seem to have a real presence; but let us not be too precipitate in our conclusions.

2. The learned Prelate proceeds to teach us that "to eat the *body* of Christ is an act of the " *mind*: that Christ is our spiritual food, and " faith the faculty by which we eat that food, and " therefore that to eat Christ is to believe in him."* Here the right reverend Prelate appears to me to pull down with one hand what he had built with the other. "To eat Christ is to believe in him." Of course the only presence which he allows is a mental, not a real, presence. Christ is present to the mind only inasmuch as he is the object of the mind's belief. But in this case what is there to distinguish the sacrament from any other religious ceremony? In any of them Christ may be the object of the belief of the mind. The christian, who with a true faith repeats the apostle's creed, as certainly professes his belief, as he who receives the sacrament. Yet who ever conceived, that in the recital of the creed, the true body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received? This doctrine, if it be properly examined, reduces the real presence of Christ to a real absence. According to it, Christ is no more really present to

* Grounds, p. 39.

the communicant, than the Emperor of China is really present to me, when I think on him.

“ To think and believe,” says the Bishop of Durham, “ are as really acts of the mind, as to eat is an act of the body. What is done by the mind is as truly done as what is done by the body. The body of Christ is therefore as truly, as verily and indeed, received by faith, as the bread is by the mouth.”* This is most singular language. I certainly distrust my own judgment, as I cannot boast, like the right reverend Prelate, of having studied in a reformed university:† but if the prejudices of education do not strangely deceive me, this doctrine is pregnant with the most paradoxical consequences. Whatever is the object of the operations of the mind, is, it seems, eaten by the mind ; is as truly, as verily and indeed, taken and received by such operations, as corporeal food is by the body. Thus if you meditate on heaven and the joys of the blessed, you eat heaven and the joys of the blessed ; you take and receive them verily and indeed. If you meditate on hell and its inhabitants, you eat hell and its inhabitants ; you take and receive them verily and indeed. What a capacious stomach an orthodox mind must have !‡

* Grounds, p. 40.

† Bishop of Durham’s Charge, p. 11.

‡ In a note the learned Prelate directs us to two very ancient teachers, for the true meaning of the words, to eat the body and drink the blood of Christ (p. 44.) Perhaps the anticipation of the

According to the dietetic language of the Bishop's theology, to believe in Christ, and to eat

reader has already led him to those who are frequently styled the fathers of the church, to a Chrysostom, a Cyril, an Ambrose, &c. No : the Bishop's doctors are of still greater antiquity : they lived before christianity was preached ; they are Cicero and Homer. " We feed on the object of our devotion," (i. e. eat the body of Christ) " as Calchas, in the anxiety of his heart, fed on his own " thoughts ; *ipse suum cor edens*, as Cicero translates the words of " Homer." Now this passage, which should be so precious in the estimation of every orthodox churchman, deserved I think more honourable mention. It should have been transcribed, or referred to. At least, through compassion to the ignorance of his readers, the Bishop should not have furnished them with a deceitful clue, by attributing this discovery in the art of feeding to Calchas, when it is due to Bellerophon. I will transcribe both the original, and Cicero's translation. Bellerophon, perceiving himself an object of hatred to all the gods, retired into solitude, where he consumed his soul in grief:—

Ἦτοι ο καππεδιον το Αληιον οιος αλατο,

Ον θυμον κατεδαι, πατον ανθρωπων αλειων.

Ιλιαδ, Z. 201.

Which Cicero thus translates:—

Qui miser in campis mœrens errabat Aleis,

Ipse suum cor edens, hominum vestigia vitans.

Tusc. quæ. l. iii.

Now I think this a very unfortunate illustration ; for, first, the man who feeds on the anxiety of his own heart, has, at the best, but a very sorry meal of it ; and, secondly, the Bishop contends, that to eat Christ is to believe in him, to meditate on him. But do the words of Homer or of Cicero mean that Bellerophon believed in his soul or heart, or that he meditated on it? Truly,

the body of Christ, are two synonymous expressions. They denote one and the same thing. Of course, since acts of faith can be exercised anywhere and at any time, Christ's body may be eaten anywhere and at any time: and this consequence the right reverend Prelate candidly admits. Moreover it will follow, that Christ's body will be eaten by every "considerate" believer, as often as he repeats the creed; and the same benefits will be derived to the soul from the repetition of the creed, as from the sacrament. For, if we may believe the catechism, the benefit derived from the sacrament is the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ; and, since the same body and blood are really received by the recital of the creed, I presume the soul will receive from it equal strength and nourishment. Indeed it appears to me that the creed may claim the superiority over the sacrament. The latter can only be administered on certain occasions: it requires the assistance of a clergyman, and the presence of another communicant. But by reciting the creed, you may eat the body of Christ by yourself, whenever you please, and without any obligation to others. The Bishop of Durham has indeed endeavoured to point out one circumstance, in which he thinks the sacrament possesses an ad-

this is one of the *difficiles nugæ* of orthodoxy, and only serves to shew that the time described by the poet is come,

When churchmen scripture for the classics quit—
Polite apostates from God's grace to wit.

vantage over the creed: and this depends on the theory of the association of ideas. "The act of eating bread," he says, "and drinking wine, in obedience to a command of Christ, and in remembrance of his death, easily associates itself in the mind with another act of obedience to Christ, that is, eating the flesh of Christ as the bread of life, and drinking his blood, without which we have no life in us." I think, however, that all this is still more effectually performed in the repetition of the creed: for we cannot repeat it with attention without exercising an act of belief in Christ, and recalling to our minds his passion and death.

St Paul assures us that the unworthy communicant "eats and drinks damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body, that he is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." These are strong expressions, and evidently imply a profanation of the body and blood of Christ. But the doctrine of the Bishop of Durham leaves nothing for the unworthy communicant to profane. According to him, the unworthy communicant is an unbeliever who cannot, or an inconsiderate christian who does not, exercise an act of faith. To these, since it is faith which constitutes the presence of the body and blood of Christ, that body and blood are not present. As they cannot receive them, so they cannot profane them. They cannot be guilty of that body and blood, which to them has no existence.*

* The Bishop censures the Vindicator for having observed,

But are there no unworthy communicants besides the unbeliever and the inconsiderate christian? The right reverend Prelate has often told us that to eat the body of Christ is “to digest his precepts.” Now it is well known that to many christians these precepts are rather difficult of digestion: and I think it possible that some communicants may be very seriously troubled with this spiritual dyspepsia. Let us suppose such a one, that he may qualify himself for office, or for any other reason, to receive the sacrament: let us suppose him, while he receives it, to exercise an act of faith, which is certainly possible, and which will take him out of the class of unbelievers, and that of inconsiderate christians. Now, I ask, does this man receive worthily or unworthily? If worthily, then to digest the precepts of Christ is not a necessary requisite, which contradicts the doctrine of the Bishop of Durham. If unworthily, then the unworthy communicant, who exercises an act of

that, according to his system, St Paul should have said unworthy communicants were deprived, instead of guilty, of the body and blood of Christ. “They cannot,” he says, “be deprived of what they have not. They are without God and Christ, for they are not in all their thoughts.” It makes little difference in the force of the Vindicator’s argument. I do not, however, think it a very heinous offence against the propriety of language, to say of a man, who through his own fault neglects to acquire some great advantage, an estate, for example, that he has deprived himself of the estate: but I do think it would be, to say that he was guilty of the estate.

faith, must eat the body of Christ, which is contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England.

The true source of all these doctrines and inconsistencies is to be found in the established creed itself. That creed teaches that the true body of our Saviour is really present in the sacrament, though that real presence amounts, in truth, to a real absence. This, if it be not sound sense, was at least sound policy. Its original framers knew that the christian world was divided into two parties: the one consisting of the Catholics and Lutherans, who contended for the real presence of Christ's body, though they differed as to the manner of that presence; the other of the Zuinglians and Calvinists, who rejected the real presence, and admitted nothing more than a bare figure and memorial of the death of Christ. By appearing to admit both opinions into different parts of the articles, catechism, and rubrics, they opened a door for proselytes from either party, who might thus become orthodox churchmen, and still retain their favourite opinions. Thus the original articles published by the authority of Edward VI. contained a long paragraph against the "real and bodily presence," as they term it: which paragraph, though it was subscribed by both houses of convocation in the reign of Elizabeth, was omitted by the command of that female head of the church. "The design of government," says Burnet, "was at that time much turned to the drawing over the body of the nation to the reformation,

“ in whom the old leaven had gone deep ; and no
 “ part of it deeper than the belief of the corporeal
 “ presence of Christ in the sacrament : therefore
 “ it was thought not expedient to offend them by
 “ so particular a definition in this matter, in which
 “ the very word, real presence, was rejected.”*
 In like manner, in the second Book of Common
 Prayer, published by Edward VI. was inserted a
 long rubric, rejecting “ all adoration unto any real
 “ and essential presence of Christ’s natural flesh
 “ and blood.” This also was laid aside by order
 of Elizabeth. “ It being the queen’s design,” says
 Wheatly, “ (as I have already observed more
 “ than once) to unite the nation as much as she
 “ could, in one faith, it was therefore recom-
 “ mended to the divines to see there should be no
 “ definition made against the aforesaid notion, but
 “ that it should remain as a speculative opinion
 “ not determined, but in which every one might
 “ be left to the freedom of his own mind.”† King

* Burnet, Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, p. 308.
 “ This part of the article was omitted in 1562, probably with a
 “ view to give less offence to those who maintained the corporeal
 “ presence, and to comprehend as many as possible in the esta-
 “ blished church.” Bishop of Lincoln’s Elements of Christian
 Theology, vol. ii. p. 483.

† Wheatly, Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 534.
 That which it was then lawful for every one to do according to his
 own judgment, is now by the Bishop of Durham declared to be
 idolatry. The rubric was re-inserted in 1661, with this alteration,
 that *corporeal* presence was substituted for *real* and *essential* pre-
 sence.

James imitated the caution of his predecessor; and when he commissioned Bishop Overal, then Dean of St Paul's, to add to the catechism the explanation of the sacraments, was careful that the real presence should be taught in such manner as might satisfy the patrons of that doctrine. Let us examine the words of the catechism.

In it we are told that "the inward part of the sacrament, or the thing signified, is the body and blood of Christ:" by which is meant the real body that was broken, and the real blood that was shed for us, according to the Bishop of Durham. We are next told that "this same body and blood," the thing signified, "are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper." But how can this be, if they be not there? The words *taken* and *received* evidently allude to the actions of taking the bread and the cup into the hands, and of receiving them by the mouth. If then, when you take the bread into your hands, you take the real body of Christ, and when you take the cup into your hands, you take the real blood of Christ, does it not follow that the real body and blood of Christ must be there? Such, at least, is the obvious meaning of the words; and if it be the obvious it must be the true meaning: for the catechism was not written to be the subject of logical and grammatical disquisitions. It was intended for the instruction of children and the unlearned: its language must of course be supposed easy and perspicuous: and the

meaning which naturally presents itself to the reader must be considered as the meaning originally intended by him who composed, and those who authorized it. In any other supposition you convict both, of duplicity or folly.

I shall, perhaps, be told, that these and similar passages should be explained by the twenty-eighth article, which clearly shews in what sense the church of England understands the real presence. I think, however, that from the cautious manner in which that article is worded, an argument may be deduced in favour of the Catholic doctrine. The words are, “ the body of Christ is given, taken, “ and eaten in the supper, only after a heavenly “ and spiritual manner.” Be it so. Catholics say as much. But does this heavenly and spiritual manner prevent it from being the real body that was broken, and the real blood that was shed for us? If so, that which is taken and received in the sacrament may be the influence of Christ’s body and blood, the graces which he has purchased for us, the title to a heavenly inheritance, or any thing else that it may please the ingenuity of our adversaries to suggest: but it certainly is not the inward part or thing signified, which, according to the catechism, is the real body and the real blood of Christ. But if, on the contrary, this spiritual manner does not exclude the reality of the body and blood of Christ, then my former argument remains in all its force. And here I may observe, that the article says more

than the catechism. It says that the body of Christ is given, as well as taken and eaten, in the Lord's supper. As the action of giving is prior to that of taking and eating, the body of Christ must exist in the sacrament before it is taken and eaten by the communicant. "The mean by which it is taken and eaten is faith." But by what mean is it given? On this head the article is silent: and, I think, with some reason. For it cannot be given by faith. To exercise an act of faith "is to eat Christ;" and undoubtedly to eat, and to give to another to eat, are two very different things.

The same doctrine, of really giving in the sacrament the body and blood of Christ to the faithful, I find in Dean Nowell's Catechism for Schools, first published in 1570. *Corpus et sanguis Christi fidelibus in cœna domini præbentur, ab illisque accipiuntur, comeduntur, et bibuntur, cœlesti tantum et spirituali modo veré tamen atque reipsa.** So that, when it was asserted, by a Catholic controvertist, that, according to the established doctrine, the bread of the supper is but a figure of Christ, Bishop Montague had some reason to answer, "Is but a sign or figure, and no more! Strange! And yet our formal words are, *This is my body: this is my blood. This is* is more than this figureth, or designeth. A bare figure is but a phantasm. He gave *substance* and really sub-

* P. 59.

“*sisting essence*, who said, this is my body : this is “my blood.”* I know that both this divine, and others who have held a similar language, have on other occasions taught the contrary doctrine ; but this corroborates my assertion, since it shews that, in endeavouring to defend the tenets of the established creed, they were compelled first to acknowledge a real presence, and then to explain it away, till it meant a real absence.

As Archbishop Wake is one of the infallible doctors, from whose decision the right reverend Prelate will not allow Catholics to appeal, I have been curious to learn what were his sentiments on this important subject. In his catechism, entitled *The Principles of the Christian Religion explained*, he asks this question : Are the body and blood of Christ really distributed to every communicant, in this sacrament ? The answer is in the negative. “No, they are not. For then every communicant, whether prepared or not, would alike “receive Christ’s body and blood there.” But, allow me to ask, is not this doctrine contradictory to the article ? The article says, the body of Christ is given : the catechism, that it is not given. Nor let it be said, that the article speaks of the faithful only, while the catechism speaks of every communicant. For the rest of the answer shews that it refers to every communicant distributively, and includes the faithful as well as the unfaithful.

* New Gag, p. 250, anno 1624.

“ That which is given by the priest to the com-
 “ municant is, as to its nature, the same after the
 “ consecration that it was before, viz. bread and
 “ wine ; only altered as to its *use* and signifi-
 “ cation.” The next question is one which very
 naturally occurs. “ If the body and blood of
 “ Christ be not really given, and distinguished
 “ by the priest, how can they be verily and indeed
 “ taken and received by the faithful communi-
 “ cant ?” Before I transcribe the answer, I must
 observe, this question proves, that according to
 the archbishop, and in opposition to the article,
 the body of Christ is not given even to the faithful
 communicant. The following is his answer :
 “ That which is given by the priest is, as to its
 “ substance, bread and wine : as to its sacramen-
 “ tal nature and signification, it is the figure, or
 “ representation, of Christ’s body and blood,
 “ which was broken and shed for us. The very
 “ body and blood of Christ *as yet it is not*. But
 “ being with faith and piety received by the
 “ communicant, it becomes to him, by the bless-
 “ ing of God, and the grace of the Holy Spirit,
 “ *the very body and blood of Christ.*” Here at
 last we have undoubtedly a real presence. The
 figure or representation of Christ’s body and
 blood, which, as yet, was not the very body
 and blood of Christ, at last becomes his very
 body and blood. Is not this at least a change of
 the bread and wine into the body and blood of
 Christ ? Reader, be not so easily imposed upon.

The whole is nothing more than a theological phantasmagoria. Ask the archbishop how the bread and wine becomes to the faithful and worthy communicant the very body and blood of Christ, and he will answer you, "As it entitles him to a part in the sacrifice of his death, and to the benefits thereby procured to all his faithful and obedient servants." Thus, in the short space of three lines, the very body and blood of Christ vanish away, and leave in their place a mere title to spiritual benefits. Thus do we learn, that, after all that the primate had said about the very body and blood of Christ, he meant no such thing as the body and blood of Christ, but only a right to a part in the sacrifice of his death!

It may, perhaps, have been owing to the prejudices of a popish education, but it was a long time before I could form a distinct notion of the meaning attached by orthodox writers to this expression: "a real presence of the body and blood of Christ after a spiritual manner." My ignorance was at last dispelled by the luminous distinction of Bishop Taylor, between the signification of the word spiritual in orthodox, and its signification in popish language. "By spiritually present, the papists mean present after the manner of a spirit: we mean, present to our spirits only."* But what kind of a real presence is that, which is neither after the manner of a body, nor after the manner

* Quoted by Wake, Discourse of the holy Eucharist, p. 66.

of a spirit? According to this doctrine, Christ's body and blood are no otherwise present in the eucharist, than the invisible lady was present in the chest: that is, they are present to the apprehension of the communicant, but in reality absent.

Such, reader, are some of the reasons which induced me to make the assertion that has given so much offence to the Bishop of Durham; and when thou considerest, that the obvious meaning of the doctrine, which I have ventured to oppose, is contradictory to itself; that, of its expositors, scarcely two can agree in the same interpretation; and that however zealous they may at first appear in the defence of a real presence, they always end by maintaining a real absence, I trust thou wilt conclude, that my opinion was not rashly and precipitately formed.

In conclusion, should aught occur in the preceding pages, that can give pain to the feelings of any sincere believer in the established creed, I am sorry for it. The circumstances in which I am placed, must be my apology. It were hard indeed, if, in repelling an unjust aggression, I were not allowed, occasionally at least, to aim a blow at my adversary. The blame, if blame there be, must rest with those who provoked the contest, and who have hitherto conducted it, I must say, with asperity and intemperance. If the learned Prelate and his advocates are still determined to continue the discussion, why should it not be continued in the spirit of christian moderation, and

christian charity? Let them recollect, that some respect is due to the opinions and feelings of the majority of the christian world. Let them not arrogate to themselves the exclusive possession of intellect and knowledge: nor, on the credit of a superiority to which they have no claim, presume to treat their adversaries with insolence and contempt. Above all, let them be true: let them state our doctrine as it is: and then, if they can, let them refute it with temperance and candour. Controversy, conducted in this manner, will be no disgrace to its authors, and may contribute to the discovery or propagation of truth: but if they refuse to condescend to so equitable a request, they must abide the consequences. I trust the catholic body will always contain writers both able and willing to teach illiberality to blush, and to expose the artifices of misrepresentation.

APPENDIX.

WE learn from the mythology of the ancients, that Jason had no sooner sown the teeth of the dragon, than each tooth grew up into a warrior. In like manner the Right Reverend Prelate preached his Charge, and from each paragraph seems to have started a champion. Already have I had to encounter Elijah Index, and the Durham Clergyman, and Mr Faber, and Mr Le Mesurier, and the Bishop of Durham,

Stiphelumque, Bromumque,
Antimachumque, Helimumque, securiferumque Pyracmon.

Now to this phalanx of worthies, I have to add a new hero, a Parochial Minister of the diocese of Durham. This gentleman conceives himself selected by Heaven as a second David to encounter the popish man of Gath: and, in imitation of his prototype, advances into the field with five stones in his scrip, which he denominates letters,* and, with which he threatens to break the head of his uncircumcised antagonist. Now, though I am

* See A Defence of the Doctrine and Worship of the Church of England, in Five Letters addressed to the Author of a Letter to a Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham, p. 2. When I consider the number of writers who have undertaken to refute the Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge, I begin to suspect that there is something more in that little tract than appears at first sight.

not very apprehensive as to the issue of the contest, I must beg permission to enter my protest against the principle on which it has been undertaken. The modern David is not commissioned by Saul, but by himself: he believes himself bound by his ordination to attack me. But the principle equally applies to every clergyman of the Established Church; and were it once admitted, every clergyman of the Established Church would be embattled against me: thousands of arms would be raised to throw their stones at me: and I must inevitably sink under the weight and multitude, though I were possessed of the strength and stature of the champion of the Philistines.

If the real object of the parochial minister be to praise the Bishop of Durham, he acts wisely. The pious liberality of our Catholic forefathers has enabled that Prelate to provide amply for the wants and conveniences of his advocates; and I sincerely trust that he will not prove a second Saul to this orthodox David. But, if the object of the writer be, as he asserts it is, to vindicate from misrepresentation the doctrine of the Bishop of Durham, I can inform him that he will not succeed. That Prelate had condemned, in the most pointed terms, the Catholic doctrine respecting good works. Had I not then a right to impute to him the contradictory doctrine? But, says David, such is not his real opinion. Be it so: the consequence will be, either that the Bishop misrepresented his own, or that he was ignorant of our doctrine. My ingenious opponent may select either of the two conclusions. Neither can reflect disgrace upon me.

What is it that the parochial minister wishes to prove against the Remarker? That the solifidian tenet is not the doctrine of the Church of England? He acknowledges that it is contained in the articles. That it is not a doctrine pregnant with

the most pernicious consequences? He confesses that it is, when not rightly understood; but contends, that the Bishop of Durham has so explained it, as to render it perfectly innocuous, by shewing that with faith must be united the practice of good works. Now, admitting this, what more will it prove than the accuracy of my assertion, that protestant theologians “had learned to blush
 “at the extravagance of this solifidian doctrine;
 “and, by the aid of ingenious distinctions, had endeavoured to expound it in a sense more agreeable to reason, and less dangerous to morality?”* The obvious meaning of the doctrine, that “we
 “are saved by faith without good works,” cannot escape the dullest understanding. It is too favourable to the passions not to be easily comprehended. Yet, if we ask an orthodox theologian, whether, if our faith be without works, we can be saved, he will answer in the negative. To reconcile these two assertions, that “we are saved by
 “faith without works,” and “that a faith without
 “works cannot save us,” let us have recourse to the distinctions recommended by the Bishop of Durham. “To be saved by faith, without works,
 “that is, *nullo operum adjumento*, has a very different meaning from being saved by faith without
 “works, that is, *per fidem infructuosam*. In the
 “first sense, *without works* is the attribute of the
 “verb; in the second, it is the attribute of the
 “noun. The difference is still more striking in
 “Greek. We are saved *δια πίστεως, ἀνευ ἔργων*, but not
 “*δια πίστεως τῆς ἀνευ ἔργων*. For, we are saved by faith,
 “—without works; but not by the faith that is
 “without works.”† Now I appeal to the reader, whether it be likely that God should reveal, for

* Letter to a Clergyman, p. 55.

† Bishop of Durham's Charge, quoted by the Author of the Defence of the Doctrine, &c. p. 22.

the belief of the Church of England, doctrines which cannot be explained properly, except in Latin and Greek? I thought it had been the privilege of the people of England to have their articles, as well as the scriptures, in their native tongue. I will, however, endeavour to illustrate these distinctions, by an example which will be more readily understood. Suppose an orthodox theologian to assert, that, at the battle of Vimiera, the French were beaten by the English without clothes. If he be desired to explain his meaning, his answer will be as follows. “To be beaten by the English without clothes, that is, *ab Anglis*, “*nullo vestimentorum adjumento*, has a very different meaning from being beaten by the English without clothes, that is, *ab Anglis nudis*. “In the first sense, without clothes, is the attribute of the verb: in the second, it is the attribute of the noun. The difference is still more striking in Greek. The French were beaten “*υπο των Αγγλων, ανευ ιματιων* but not *υπα των Αγγλων* “*των ανευ ιματιων*, by the English—without clothes; “—but not by the English that were without “clothes.” If by this illustration I shall have contributed to render the solifidian doctrine less liable to be misinterpreted, I shall think I have served the cause of morality.

According to the Catholic doctrine, “we are “saved by faith, which worketh by love.” This doctrine is scriptural*, and is not contradictory to the explanations which we give of it. It perhaps had been well if the new apostles had adopted it: but then they would not have had the merit of reforming. It was, therefore, resolved that we should be justified by faith only,† though St James says, we are not justified by faith only.‡ The magnanimity of Luther made light of the difficulty. The writer of that epistle, he exclaim-

* Gal. v. 6. † Article 11. ‡ St. James, 11. 24.

ed, is a blockhead: it shall no longer be a part of the scriptures; and expunged it from his Bible. But our reformers were still more magnanimous. They declared that the article should be orthodox doctrine, and that the epistle should still be scripture. To their successors they left the important task of reconciling them together.

With this short answer I must request my new antagonist to be satisfied. Without meaning any disrespect to him, I must be allowed to attend to the Bishop. That Prelate has threatened to send his clergy several more letters similar to the last; and it would be indecorous in me to leave the diocesan for the parochial minister.

FINIS.

Printed by Edw. Walker, Pilgrim-Street, Newcastle.







